COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Volume III SPRING 1951 Number 2

To Fernand Baldensperger on his Eightieth Birthday
American Comparatists Dedicate this Issue

Boscán and the Classics. By Arnold G. Reichenberger 97

Circe's Swine: Plays by Gorky and O'Neill. By Helen Muchnic 119

Un Thème des Romanciers naturalistes: La Matrone d'Éphèse. By G. Hainsworth 129

Ronsard, Du Bartas, and the Homeric Comparison. By A. Emerson Creore 152

Albert Camus' *Caligula*: Ancient Sources and Modern Parallels. By Walter A. Strauss 160

An Imitation of Perrault in England: Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's "Carabosse." By Robert Halsband 174

Shakespeare in Italy. By N. Orsini 178

Book Reviews 181

Books Received 192

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation of the Comparative Literature Section of the Modern Language Association of America

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1949, at the postoffice at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.

Comparative Literature

Editor

CHANDLER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor

WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Editorial Board

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D. C.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

VICTOR LANGE
Cornell University
Ithaca, N. Y.

AUSTIN WARREN
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Mich.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, *Comparative Literature* provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, movements, genres, periods, and authors —from the earliest times to the present. They particularly welcome longer studies on comprehensive topics and on problems of criticism.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to: Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The subscription rate is $3.50 a year. The price of single copies is $1.00. Correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to: University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon. Correspondence concerning exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
https://abbassa.wordpress.com

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

VOLUME III SPRING 1951 NUMBER 2

BOSCÁN AND THE CLASSICS

ARNOLD G. REICHENBERGER

IF THE position of a Renaissance writer towards the classics can be the touchstone for determining to what degree and in which way he was affected by the spirit of the Renaissance, an analysis of individual Spanish writers should provide us with the "precise knowledge" and some of the "fundamental facts"[1] which we ought to have for the larger task of defining the nature of the Spanish Renaissance. Boscán's place in the history of Spanish letters as the "patriarca de la escuela italo-hispana"[2] particularly warrants a special study of his attitude towards the classics. His role as a pioneer in the adaptation of classical literature to Spanish was already well established at the end of the sixteenth century. In Pedro de Cáceres' introduction to the second book of the *Obras de Gregorio Silvestre*, edition of 1599, we read:

> A modo de las declamaciones de los oradores, parece que de propósito tomaron los poetas de nuestro tiempo los argumentos de las fábulas antiguas y quisieron aventajarse a los griegos y latinos en el estilo y conceptos. El primero que se atrevió a esto en España fué Boscán en la *Fábula de Hero y Leandro*, que también en esta sazón fué puesta en toscano por Bernardo Tasso, y ambos la hicieron en verso suelto.[3]

Nor has Boscán's classical background been overlooked by modern scholars. F. Flamini[4] praises him for having understood that Italian poetry of the Renaissance owes its universalism to the

[1] Asked for by J. E. Gillet, *HR*, XIV (1946), 173, and supported by O. H. Green, "A Critical Survey of Scholarship in the Field of the Spanish Renaissance," *SP*, XLIV (1947), 256-257.

[2] M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Juan Boscán* (Madrid, 1919), p. 17.

[3] Quoted by Angel González y Palencia y Eugenio Mele, *Vida y Obras de Don Diego Hurtado y Mendoza* (Madrid, 1943), III, 110-111.

[4] Francesco Flamini, "La 'Historia de Leandro y Hero' e l'*Octava Rima*," in *Studi di storia letteraria italiana e straniera* (Livorno, 1895), pp. 392-393.

spirito di classicismo . . . in essa trasfuso, e che perciò, volendo felicemente emularla, bisognava aver presenti, oltre a Dante, al Petrarca, all'Ariosto, al Sannazzaro, al Bembo, anche i greci e i latini.

Menéndez y Pelayo[5] follows Flamini's evaluation and makes a number of very tangible contributions towards our knowledge of Boscán's sources. In the opinion of Professor Arturo Marasso,[6] Garcilaso and Boscán

midieron la extensión, pesaron, uno más que el otro, la validez del idioma en sus fuentes, crearon, con la influencia italiana, un universo poético grecolatino, levantaron, especialmente Garcilaso, la literatura española a regiones de universalidad depurada.

Yet a comprehensive study of Boscán's classicism has never been made. For this purpose we have to bring together all the available information, regardless of whether it is new or has been adduced before. As a by-product of this investigation we may be able to contribute to a more detailed knowledge of Boscán's sources.[7]

As to the classical element in Boscán's education, there is only one fact we know with certainty. In 1507, at the age of from fifteen to twenty years,[8] he still was or at least recently had been the pupil of the Italian humanist Lucio Marineo Siculo,[9] while the latter was the educator of the pages of the Royal Household, royal chaplain, and chronicler. Hence Menéndez y Pelayo is justified in his belief that Boscán received his instruction at the court and not in any of the universities.[10]

To this it can be added that it seems probable that Boscán knew Greek. In the *Privilegio* (p. 7)[11] there is listed *una tragedia de Eurípides, . . . autor griego* among the literary papers which the poet's widow intended to publish. The context in which mention of Euripides' tragedy is made (see below) allows no other interpretation than that it was a translation into Castilian. Now, the first Latin translation of Euripides appeared in Basel, in August 1541.[12] It seems very unlikely

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 46.

[6] Arturo Marasso, "Juan Boscán," *BAAL*, XI (1943), 685.

[7] See Joseph G. Fucilla, "The Present Status of Renaissance and 'Siglo de Oro' Poetry," *Hispania*, XXX (1947), 82: "... little has been added to the sources of Boscán's poetry other than what has been noted by Knapp and Menéndez y Pelayo."

[8] Martín de Riquer, editor of the *Cancionero Barcelonés* (Barcelona, 1945), fixes the date of Boscán's birth as between 1487 and 1492 (p. 10). Riquer discovered new biographical evidence in the archives of Barcelona.

[9] Menéndez y Pelayo, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-33; Lucio Marineo Siculo, *Epistolario*, ed. Pietro Verrua (Rome, 1940), p. 127. On Marineo Siculo see Caro Lynn, *A College Professor of the Renaissance: Lucio Marineo Siculo* (Chicago, 1937).

[10] *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

[11] All references simply by page number are to *Las obras de Boscán*, ed. William I. Knapp (Madrid, 1875). Spelling and accentuation have been modernized.

[12] See Euripides, *Opera Omnia*, ed. Barnes et al., I (Glasgow, 1821), cxxxiii.

that this translation reached Spain before Boscán's death in April or May 1542.[13] The first Italian version was not available before 1543, when Ludovico Dolce's translation of the *Hecuba* was published.[14] In view of these facts the assumption seems warranted that Boscán knew Greek. As for Musaeus—whose poem on Hero and Leander Boscán translated and expanded—the first edition (by Marcos Musuros, Venice, Aldus, *ca.* 1494) was provided with a Latin translation.

The *Privilegio*, dated February 18, 1543, provides a list of the works of Boscán and Garcilaso which Boscán's widow intended to publish. The mere enumeration of the titles gives us an impression of the new world of poetic genres taken from the classics that came into being together with the Italian forms:

> . . . una sátira contra los avarientos; dos églogas pastoriles; una canción y dos sonetos a la muerte de Garcilaso de la Vega; y otra canción, dos epístolas—una es respuesta de una que le envió don Diego de Mendoza—en cosas familiares y de amistad; un capítulo en cosas de palacio; ciertos sonetos y canciones del dicho Garcilaso; una octava rima; una elegía a la muerte de don Bernardino de Toledo, hermano del duque de Alva; otra obra de la historia o fábula de Leandro, según se halla en Museo, autor griego, y traducido en verso castellano; una tragedia de Eurípides, asimismo autor griego, y otras algunas obras del dicho Garcilaso de la Vega y del dicho Boscán [p. 7].[15]

Boscán's classicist Renaissance attitude toward the ancients as the fountainhead of literature becomes explicit in the Prologue to Book II of the *Obras*, where he justifies his introduction of the new Italianate meters (pp. 171-172). The Castilian verse, he argues, is only good to express the thoughts of the *vulgo* and lacks any authority invested in it through the prestige of its originators, who are unknown. The Italianate meters, on the other hand, have the advantage of great flexibility ("una disposición para recebir cualquier materia, o grave o sotil o dificultoso o fácil"). In addition, there is a clearly established line of authoritative poets who developed these meters: Petrarch—Dante—the Provençal poets with their Catalan offspring Ausias March—the Latins—the Greeks. He comes to the conclusion that

> este género de trovas, y con la autoridad del valor propio y con la reputación de los antiguos y modernos que le han usado, es dino, no solamente de ser recibido de una lengua tan buena como es la castellana, mas aun de ser en ella preferido a todos los versos vulgares.

---

[13] See Menéndez y Pelayo, *op. cit.*, p. 149.

[14] See Emile Le Grand, *Bibliographie Hellénique* . . . (Paris, n.d.), I, 20-22. The first almost complete edition of Euripides (Venice, Aldus, 1514) had been entrusted to Marcos Musuros. See Emile Le Grand, *op. cit.*, pp. cxiii and 79 ff.

[15] The two eclogues and the elegy on the death of Don Bernardino de Toledo are by Garcilaso. The others we must assume to be Boscán's work, although the satire, the *canción* on the death of Garcilaso, and the Euripides translation were not published in the posthumous collection and are not known to us.

Thus Boscán, the literary critic, sees one uninterrupted evolution from the Greeks to Petrarch, and wishes by his innovations to lift Castilian literature out of its regional isolation and bring it into the main stream of what was at that time European literature.

Boscán's respect for the classics is, then, clearly established. This humanism is not limited to critical and aesthetic considerations; it is carried over into life. When he goes with his wife to a brook in the woods to enjoy an afternoon of good reading, it is the classical epic and elegiac poets they take along:

> Tenemos nuestros libros en las manos
> Y no se cansarán de andar contando
> Los hechos celestiales y mundanos.
> *Virgilio* a Eneas estará cantando
> Y *Homero* el corazón de Aquiles fiero
> Y el navegar de Ulises rodeando.
> *Propercio* verná allí por compañero,
> El cual dirá con dulces harmonías
> Del arte que a su Cintia amó primero.
> *Catulo* acudirá por otras vías
> Y, llorando de Lesbia los amores,
> Sus trampas llorará y chocarrerías.
> Esto me advertirá de mis dolores;
> Pero volviendo a mi placer presente,
> Terné mis escarmientos por mejores.
> (Pp. 419-420)

The last three tercets make it evident that the elegiac poets struck a particulary responsive chord in his heart. Melancholy love is the main theme of Boscán's poetry in both the vernacular and the Italianate meters and they are imbued with an autobiographical tendency.[16] In a passage of the *Octava Rima* (p. 445) these poets, together with Tibullus and Ovid, are seen in the light of the *dolce stil nuovo*, Petrarch, and the Neoplatonists:

> Una virtud que nunca se desmanda,
> Virtud que del amor deciende y llueve,
> . . . hizo que aquel gran *Veronés*
> Por su Lesbia cantase dulcemente;
> Y hizo por Corina al *Sulmonés*
> Abrir la vena de su larga fuente;
> Cantadas Delia y Cintia las verés
> Por *Tibulo* y *Propercio* juntamente.
> Todos éstos y éstas se perdieran,
> Si esta virtud de amor no recibieran . . .

—an idealizing interpretation which is contradictory to the more realistic one in the *Epístola* tercet on Catullus and Lesbia, just quoted. Bos-

[16] See J. P. Wickersham Crawford, "Notes on the Chronology of Boscán's Verses," *MP*, XXV (1927-28), 29-36.

cán's famous sonnet on the death of Garcilaso (no. 91, p. 220) hinges on the comparison between

> El hijo de Peleo que celebrado
> Tanto de *Homero* fué con alta lira...

and Garcilaso, compressing Achilles' fate into the quatrains and reaching the conclusion in the first tercet that

> Si la fortuna de un tal hombre es gloria,
> Con gloria quedarás tu, Garcilaso,
> Pues con la dél tu gloria va medida.[17]

The almost mythical name of Homer lends dignity to the person praised.

Plato and Xenocrates are contrasted with each other (p. 414). Plato is recommended as the guide to be followed in a life ordered by the Renaissance concept of *templanza*. Xenocrates, Plato's pupil and second head of the Academy after the master's death, figures as a representative advocate of extreme ethical rigidity, by virtue of his *dura vía*. Xenocrates left no complete written work and the concept Boscán had of him probably goes back, either directly or indircetly, to Diogenes Laertius, IV, 2 ff.[18] In the *coplas* of Book I only one classic author appears, Terence. *Copla* 38 (p. 122) bears this title: "La sentencia de *Terencio* que dice: 'In rebus irrecuperabilibus sola oblivio est medella,' traduce Boscán." Then follows an eight-line *copla*. The Latin quotation is prose and so shows that the sentence in this form came from a mediaeval *florilegium*. Anders Gagnér, who has studied this genre of literature, tells us[19] that Terence was read in prose during the Middle Ages and widely excerpted for his sententious phrases. It is quite possible that collections of sentences of Terence were published in book form well into the sixteenth century, since we find in the catalogue of the library of Garcilaso el Inca a *Terencio, D-epigramas* [*sic*].[20] The little poem on this Latin writer is, then, to be interpreted as a bit of survival of the mediaeval type of classical learning, which, to a large degree,

[17] In the *Octava Rima* (p. 442), in a passage translated straight from Bembo (Flamini, *op. cit.*, pp. 415-416), a lady is addressed as "Alma gentil, dinisima de impero, Y que de sola vos cantase Homero." Again, the esteem in which the poems of Ausias March were held by *El Almirante* is conveyed to the reader by a comparison with Alexander's love for Homer (*Prólogo*, p. 171).

[18] The entire Greek text was first published in Basel in 1533. The first Latin translation appeared in Rome, s.a. It was reprinted in Venice, 1472, Nuremberg, 1476, and several times later. Nebrija published *dicta philosophorum*, collected mostly from Diogenes Laertius; the book is undated. See E. Le Grand, "Bibliographie Hispano-Grecque," in *Bibliographie Hispanique* (1917), p. 168.

[19] Anders Gagnér, *Florilegium Gallicum: Untersuchungen und Texte zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Florilegienliteratur* (Lund, 1936), pp. 6, 225.

[20] See José Durand, "La biblioteca del Inca," *NRFH*, II (1948), 239-264. The Terence item is no. 24, unidentified by the editor of the catalogue.

was interested in gleaning moral teachings from the writers of antiquity.

This survey of names of classical authors explicitly mentioned by Boscán gives us only a very partial view of the poet's absorption of ancient literature. We must seek, therefore, classical sources and models in order to arrive at a true appreciation of his classicism. The very first poem of the *Obras* (pp. 13-14), the dedicatory poem in hendecasyllables to the Duquesa de Soma, is an imitation of the one with which Catullus opened the collection of his poetry.[21] While the topic of both authors is the same, the comparison reveals quite different attitudes towards the *fortuna* of their poetry. Catullus, modest but optimistic, prays Minerva (*o patrona virgo*) that whatever merits his unpretentious poems (*nugas*) may have, survive for more than just one generation (*saeclo*). In Boscán we note traces of the troubadour concept, in that all the *honra* (the word is typical) and *vida* comes from the lady to whom the collection is dedicated, and in the prevalence of a somber tone of death and oblivion. Furthermore, the second line, significantly enough Boscán's own, could almost be taken as the keynote of his Christian classicism: *amor* harnessed by *virtud*, in the garb of *hermosura*, that is, the best of the ancients joined with the Christian tradition, offered in the dignified form of the new Italianate meter.

The *Epístola a Mendoza*, as has been shown elsewhere,[22] is the most revealing testimony of Boscán's humanism. In it he not only combines

---

[21] Already observed by Caro Lynn, *op. cit.*, p. 176. Compare Boscán:

"*¿A quién daré* mis amorosos versos
Que pretenden amor con virtud junto
Y desean también mostrarse hermosos?
A ti, Señora, en que todo esto cabe,"

with Catullus (I, lines 1-4):

"*Quoi dono* lepidum novum libellum
Arida modo pumice expolitum?
Corneli, tibi; namque tu solebas
Meas esse aliquid putare nugas."

And further, Boscán (p. 14):

"Si pasaren con honra, dales vida:
Y si no, no les quites el remedio
Que el tiempo les dará con su justicia;
Que mueran, y que los cubra la tierra,
Y la tierra será el eterno olvido,"

corresponds to Catullus (lines 8-10):

"quare habe tibi quidquid hoc libelli,
qualecumque; quod, o patrona virgo,
plus uno maneat perenne saeclo."

The following italicized words of the prologue "A los Lectores" (p. 4) may be an echo of Catullus' line 2: "... y quería—*después de muy bien limado y polido,* como el sin falta lo supiera hacer—dar este libro a la Señora Duquesa de Soma."

[22] *HR*, XVII (1949), 1-17.

a free handling of Horace's *Nil admirari* epistle with motifs which can be traced back to other Horatian poems and to Tibullus and Propertius, but also happily succeeds in fusing the classical heritage with a delightful realism and autobiographical frankness. "The Classics taught him to see his own environment in a new, more realistic, more humanistic light and, by their prestige, encouraged him to discover poetic matter in everyday life."[23]

Boscán's Spanish rendition of Musaeus' little epic of Hero and Leander is his most ambitious literary undertaking, both in extension and in combination of various episodes. Musaeus' poem of 343 lines has been expanded to an epic work which in length corresponds to about three to four Virgilian cantos, 2,793 hendecasyllables to be exact. This expansion is achieved by combining four different strains: (1) Musaeus provided the outline of the story and (2) Ovid's two Heroides (XVIII and XIX), *Hero Leandro* and *Leander Heroni,* tinged Boscán's psychological analysis of the two lovers. With these basic sources are combined (3) two episodes from Virgil's *Georgics,* IV, 315-567, the legend of Aristaeus and the origin of bee raising, which itself is tied up in Virgil with the Orpheus and Eurydice story,[24] and finally, (4) Proteus' complaint before Neptune about the rough treatment he received at the hands of Aristaeus, when this youth wrested from him the secret of how to appease the irate spirits who killed his bees, a story for which no source has been identified.

The technique is, in principle, the same as in the *Epístola a Mendoza.* A classical poem is taken as the guide, but is freely combined with inspirations from other sources. In the case of *La Historia de Leandro y Hero,* this procedure, for our modern taste at least, has resulted in a poetic composition which is overloaded with secondary episodes, that for long stretches completely submerge the main story, and which preserves only too little of the dramatic density and tender charm of the Greek original. Yet Boscán himself must have felt that Musaeus' epic could be improved upon or, as Pedro de Cáceres in the passage quoted above (p. 97) puts it, wanted to "aventajarse a los griegos y latinos en el estilo y conceptos." The insertion of extraneous episodes is at least partly due, no doubt, to an urge to display erudition and skill in translation; and the choice of subject matter, the nucleus of which is the Orpheus and Eurydice story, manifests once more Boscán's preference for the somber aspects of love, prevalent in his own lyrical output (the Orpheus and Eurydice myth could almost be called a senti-

[23] *Ibid.,* p. 17.

[24] See Eduard Norden, "Orpheus und Eurydike. Ein nachträgliches Gedenkblatt für Vergil," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; Philologisch-Historische Klasse,* XXII (1934), 610-683.

mental duplication of the Hero and Leander theme, since both end tragically).[25] Boscán's practice, however, was recommended by contemporary poetic theory. Max Hermann Jellinek quotes a passage from the Renaissance poetics of Marcus Hieronymus Vida in which the author recommends additions to the plot.[26]

Boscán follows the Musaeus text as faithfully as he can. He has omitted no motif compatible with his conception of the main characters and his standards of Christian ethics and morality. Yet, as far as language and style are concerned, he is satisfied if he renders the compact poetic language of Musaeus with its compound adjectives charged with meaning, in a diluted, drawn-out fashion. So

καὶ νύχιον πλωτῆρα θαλασσοπόρων ὑμεναίων
(Line 2)
(and the swimmer in the night crossing the seas for the wedding)

becomes

... la triste mar en medio ...
Y Amor acá y allá yendo y viniendo.

Or

λύχνον ἀπαγγέλλοντα διακτορίην Ἀφροδίτης
Ἡροῦς νυκτιγάμοιο γαμοστόλον ἀγγελιώτην
(Lines 6-7)
(the telling light, the messenger of Aphrodite,
bringing the word from Hero willing to celebrate
the night-wedding)

appears as

Y aquella diligente lumbrecilla,
Testigo fiel y dulce mensajera
De dos fieles y dulces amadores.
(Page 289)

The last confrontation, besides showing the paucity of Boscán's vocabulary, which mars his translation in many places, may also serve as a typical example for the general change in tone (*dulce*) and concept (*fiel*) which the legend has undergone in the Spanish version. Boscán sought to bring it into accord with the prevailing standards of sentiment and ethics of his own time. Instead of pagan sensualism we find senti-

[25] Pablo Cabañas, *El mito de Orfeo en la literatura española* (Madrid, 1948), does not consider this question.

[26] Max Hermann Jellinek, *Die Sage von Hero und Leander in der Dichtung* (Berlin, 1890), p. 88, from *Marci Hieronymi Vidae Cremonensis opera* (Antwerp, 1567), p. 424, lines 11 ff. *Poet.*, lib. II:

"Quod si longarum cordi magis ampla viarum
Sunt spatia, angustis cum res tibi finibus arcta,
In longum trahito arte. Viae tibi mille trahendi."

Incidentally, Jellinek recognizes the relationship between Musaeus and Boscán as self-evident and has not (as Flamini, *op. cit.*, pp. 385-386, following Farinelli's communication, maintains) "chiuso gli occhi all'evidenza."

mentalism and Christian struggle against love. Secretiveness of love in Musaeus is replaced by the ethos of fidelity. Whatever ethical concepts are found in the original are developed, but its sensualism is subdued. Boscán gladly seizes upon qualities of his heroine such as σωφροσύνη and αἰδώς (line 33), developing them in such a way as to make a perfect Christian Renaissance *dama* out of her, in harmony with the ideal lady of Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*,[27] which Boscán had translated into Castilian. Hero lived in a tower

repartiendo
Sus horas en honestos ejercicios
Para vivir sabrosa y cuerdamente.[28]
Este lugar sus padres se le dieron;
Pero no se le dieron por guardalla
Con guardas, ni con premias, ni estrechezas;
Su misma voluntad era su guarda.
Su vivir era *libre, mas no suelto;*
Haciendo su querer cuanto quería,
No hacía sino lo razonable, . . .
Virgen y *virginal* su vivir era;
No andaba en competencias ni asonadas,
Ni en cuentas con ajenas hermosuras.
Tan *apartada de tener envidia*
Estaba, que aun *de quien se la tenía*
Se dolía entre sí y se lastimaba.
(Page 291)

We see the humanist concept of the free but responsible person combined with the Christian ideal of virginity,[29] entirely free from the sinful feeling of envy. Of both Hero and Leander the poet says that they were

Iguales en linaje y en hacienda,
En valer, en saber y en hermosura . . .
Honra y placer de sus contentos padres.
(Page 290)

He renders with Spanish concepts Musaeus' short standard *topos* of the hero of the Greek epic whose lineage often goes back to the gods (διοτρεφὲς αἷμα λαχοῦσα referring to Hero only, line 30). Boscán feels the need for more subdued, more virginlike hues in his presentation of the scene in which Musaeus' Hero with "womanish cunning" reveals her love for Leander (lines 103-107). In Boscán she

Abajó los sus ojos blandamente
Con una pura y virginal vergüenza.
(Page 300)

[27] See Otis H. Green, "Boscán and 'Il Cortegiano': The 'Historia de Leandro y Hero.'" *Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo*, IV (1948), 4 ff.

[28] Evidently the rendering of the Greek concepts quoted in the text.

[29] παρθένος (line 55) is a standard term of Greek poetic language and lacks the connotations of *virgen*.

Describing her appearance at the festival in Sestos Boscán expands the Musaeus text, dwelling on the perfect relationship between *cuerpo* and *alma*, stressing the Renaissance concept of the balance between freedom and restraint in her behavior combined with a Petrarchan *no sé que tan admirable* that enveloped her like an aura of mysterious loveliness. In Musaeus Hero surrenders to the bittersweet sting of the Erotes without resistance, her heart glowing in the sweet fire of love (lines 166-167). With Boscán her motive for accepting Leander's courting is not only her lover's handsomeness but also *el dolor en que él se vía*, the thought that rejecting him would be *dureza* and *crueza de persona fiera*, and a sense of Christian responsibility (*que era culpa y pareciera mal*) if she should send such a fine and noble young man to his doom (pp. 311-312). She is frightened by the sudden growth of her love, seeing herself

> en un momento
> Los términos pasar todos de un golpe,

and offers the explanation that the violent passion by which she is shaken may be punishment for her sins or for the *soberbia* of her parents who put blind trust in their daughter's virtue. Yet, after all, the fault rests with her *voluntad* and she accepts the responsibility. It is the overstepping the bounds of *aurea mediocritas* and fear for her *honra* which upset her most:

> Con todo no querría tal extremo,
> Bien huelgo de quererte, mas no tanto,
> Que *en lo mucho está el mal y está el peligro,*
> Y está *el temor de errar contra mi honra,*
> Y el sospechar que te parezco mal.
> Yo estoy aquí del arte que me vees,
> *Tu mira un poco por lo que conviene*
> A poder abonarme yo conmigo,
> Y a no perder al mundo *la vergüenza.*
> (Pp. 313-314)

No wonder, then, that Boscán's Hero can keep her self-respect only by simulating that she and Leander are married. In this way she is able to

> contemplar sus gozos
> Màs libremente y con menos empacho.
> (Page 352)

Leander's character undergoes changes similar to those of Hero's and for the same reasons. Whereas Musaeus' lover, upon seeing Hero, decides unflinchingly that he will not live without beautiful Hero (line 89), in Boscán he acts exactly the opposite way. He wishes to die and tries to escape his fate:

Y en verdad quisiera hallarse lejos
De un peligro tan presto y tan extraño;
Y diera por entonces todo el gusto,
Y todo el bien de ver un bien tamaño,
Por no verse en un mal de tanto aprieto.
(Page 296)

In Musaeus Leander goes straightforward to his goal (lines 159, 196-197), whereas Boscán's Leander is full of *sollozos* and struggles with tears (p. 311). Musaeus' lover keeps throughout his resourcefulness in pursuing his goal (line 200). Rarely Boscán gives to his Leander a certain dashing bravura, as when he has him say

Ser el cielo sereno o ser escuro,
Ser prósperos los vientos o contrarios,
Por mi seguridad poco me importa.
(Page 318)

The section on his dreamy thoughts of a happy future is much expanded in Boscán. On his way back to Abydos across the sea he reflects upon the *mudanza de fortuna y de las mujeres*. He himself and his friends notice the change which has taken place in him (pp. 320-321). He has developed an almost pastoral passion for solitude (p. 322), he talks to himself and to the stones, and gives free rein to his imagination. We find, as in the poet's own love lyrics, the lover plagued by the *escrupilillo* which mars love's happiness without apparent motivation (*le estorba el deleite*, p. 322). When the final catastrophe comes, Boscán adds to the source this sentimental touch:

La postrer cosa que hizo el desdichado
Fué alzar los ojos a mirar su lumbre;
Y aquel poco de aliento que tenía
Echóle todo en un gemido bajo,
Envuelto en la mitad del nombre de Hero.
(Page 375)

The unity of sentiment is emphasized by Boscán through literal repetition at the end (p. 376) of the lines of the beginning (p. 289) about

la lumbrecilla,
Testigo fiel y dulce mensagera
Destos fieles y dulces amadores.

Christianization and spiritualization of the characters requires a like treatment of the pagan sensuousness of the love scenes. Boscán substitutes for expressions of unbridled desire such as τὴν μετανεύμενος εὐνήν (line 205) a less passionate version in which the lady (*señora*) is put on a high pedestal, adored by the lowly lover in the tradition of the *cancioneros* and the troubadours:

Señora, tras un bien tan alto,
¿Qué ha de decir un hombre que es tan bajo?
(Page 316)

He omits line 263 which suggests the intimacy of the bridal chamber, and the terse word λέχος (lines 274, 279) has no equivalent in the Spanish text (p. 359).

Another group of changes of the original text falls under the heading of modernization. Boscán wants to bring the story closer to his readers and therefore adds such phrases as

Si quieres tanto *honrarme* que me quieras
(Page 309)

and

en mí *toma venganza*
Del viento y de la mar y de la noche.
(Page 359)

Musaeus' tragically melancholy line 274 with its parallel structure

ἦν γάμος, ἀλλ' ἀχόρευτος· ἔην λέχος, ἀλλ' ἄτερ ὕμνων
(there was a wedding, but without dances; there was the bridal bed, but without songs)

is transposed into a Spanish setting (and, incidentally, loses in the process all its plastic incisiveness):

No fueron estas bodas con padrinos,
Ni con solenidad de alegres fiestas.
(Page 359)

Or, again, the young men yearn to be near Hero's beauty and to be, if not a relative, at least

su criado,
Para servilla de cualquier oficio.
(Page 295)

In two instances Boscán adds touches of realism in the manner of the *Epístola a Mendoza*, which, however, seem in bad taste and entirely un-Hellenic. One is an anachronistic comparison of the swimmer with the magnetic needle of the compass:

Y su vista a su estrella enderezando,
Como el aguja se endereza al norte.
(Page 355)

Sestos and Abydos are so close that

Oíanse los gallos y los perros
De entrambos y los humos se topaban.
(Page 290)

Alterations of this last type are, however, so few in number that they do

not appreciably affect the atmosphere of the legend in the sections based on classical sources. It is different in those parts where Boscán seems to be more or less on his own, as we shall see below. Far more numerous are Boscán's learned additions, drawn from his classical background. Mythological allusions inserted into the story have already been discussed. The same technique applies to other learned elaborations. Geographical indications of Musaeus (lines 46-50) are expanded by mentioning such well-known place names as Egeo, Helesponto; Haemonia is replaced by the more familiar Tesalia (p. 292). During the bridal night the owl is heard (p. 360), a bad omen which Boscán found necessary to add because he must have thought that omens were a topical point with classical authors.[80] Hero feels as lonely and abandoned as Ariadne "en la isla entre alimañas" after Theseus had left her (p. 361).

A careful line-by-line confrontation of the Virgilian text with that of Boscán in the Aristaeus-Orpheus and Eurydice episode reveals similar transformations. Compare the "decorporization" of Boscán (p. 331):

> Esto dicho mandó todo rocialle
> Con agua de odorífera ambrosía,
> Y él se sintió con esto *un nuevo espíritu,*
> *Tomando un nuevo ser de un nuevo hombre,*

with Virgil, *Georgics*, IV, 415-418, charged with visual detail:

> Haec ait et liquidum ambrosiae diffundit odorem:
> quo totum nati corpus perduxit; at illi
> dulcis compositis spiravit crinibus aura
> atque habilis membris venit vigor.

For rather conventional nature description see Boscán (*ibid.*):

> y el sol daba
> La vuelta encima del balcón más alto
> *Marchitando las verdes arboledas,*
> *Secando los arroyos y las fuentes,*

as against Virgil's dramatization of the effect of the rays of the sun (lines 426-428):

> et medium sol igneus orbem
> hauserat; *arebant herbae, et cava flumina siccis*
> *faucibus ad limum radii tepefacta coquebant.*

Virgil's fantastic setting of the *umida regna* of Cyrene, Aristaeus' mother (lines 360-367), intentionally kept free of any man-made architecture, is transformed by the Spanish poet into scenery in which the grandiose mixes with the pastoral:

---

[80] See also *Epístola a Mendoza*, p. 419; Jellinek, *op. cit.*, p. 88, quotes a line from the above-cited poetics of Vida to that effect.

Ya entraba en los palacios el mancebo. . .
Mirando al derredor con maravilla
Las casas, los castillos, los adarves,
Los grandes y soberbios aposentos
De peñas y de grutas naturales,
Con paredes y techos todos de agua.
Vía con esto extrañedad de montes
Con altas espesuras resonantes,
Y alegres vegas y riberas frescas
De ríos que corrían mansamente,

immediately followed by two lines containing three classical geographical names:

Entre los cuales vió Fasis y Lico,
Y la fuente do nace el Enipeo.
(Page 328)

Cyrene, like a Spanish lady, is sitting on an *estrada* (p. 326). It is interesting to note how the multitude of souls gathering around Orpheus in Hades (Virgil, lines 475-477) takes on the aspect of a Spanish *danza de la muerte* in Boscán (p. 335).[81] Boscán is quite outspoken in his presentation of the nether world to the olfatory senses (*hediondo ceno, cañas ya podridas*, p. 335), whereas Virgil renders the ugly with the less offensive negatives of adjectives denoting the beautiful or the pleasant (*deformis harundo, palus inamabilis*, lines 478-479). Nor does the Spanish poet shrink from intensifying Virgil's account of the violent death of Orpheus with realistically bloody details.[82]

Ovid's *Heroides* XVIII and XIX have been established as an additional source of Boscán by Jellinek[83] and, in greater detail, by Menéndez y Pelayo.[84] Both authors see in the two epistles the inspiration for Boscán's tendency to analyze the lovers' sentiments. According to the Spanish critic, no more than two passages can be traced back directly to Ovid —Leander's invocation to Boreas (pp. 365-366), based on *Heroides*,

[81] Compare

"matres atque viri defunctaque corpora vita
magnanimum heroum, pueri innuptaeque puellae,
impositi rogis iuvenes ante ora parentum"

with

"Madres, hijos, maridos y mujeres,
Mochachos y mancebos y doncellas,
Varones señalados en sus artes,
Caballeros en armas y letrados,
Reyes grandes y príncipes ilustres."

[82] The women

"le hicieron mil pedazos;
Los cuales siendo desparcidos todos,
Ensangrentaron feamente el campo" (p. 338).

[83] *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

[84] *Op. cit.*, pp. 345-346.

XVIII, 37 ff., and another to Neptune (pp. 371-372), taken in part from *Heroides*, XIX, 129 ff. There are, however, more Ovidian vestiges in Boscán. A number of passages of the two *Heroides* are echoed in *Leandro y Hero*. His familiarity with the *Metamorphoses* is evident in the mythological additions with which he adorns the Greek poem. The Ovidian traces are too numerous to be mentioned here and require a special note.[34a]

The episode (pp. 338-349) of Proteus' complaint before the throne of Neptune about the violence done to him when the mortals came to seek advice, the last case of Aristaeus being the most flagrant insult to his honor, may owe its general inspiration to the scenes of the councils of the gods, so numerous in classical epic poetry from Homer on. It should be noted also that the long discourses of Proteus and Oceanus, although verbose and lengthy, are well constructed, with introduction, main part, and conclusion clearly discernible in each. These orations remind us of the speeches which the classical historians inserted in their works, observing in them the rules of rhetorical theory. No direct source has been ascertained for the subject matter of the episode[35] and it might very well be Boscán's own invention. Just as he added the Virgilian matter, Boscán offered a council of gods and long speeches, motivated by his desire to adorn the original story with as many features found in classical literature as he felt compatible with it.

Boscán has inserted an interval of six days (p. 323, based on *Heroides*, XVIII, 25) during which no light appears in Hero's tower. He explains this fact by saying that the priestess has to attend the festival of Proteus' annual arrival in Sestos, where he comes to foretell the future. In Hellenistic fashion[36] he gives an aetiological story of the origin of this religious celebration. Boscán is quite aware that the episodical matter leads him away from his main theme.[37] The classical element, apart from the form of presentation (see above), is really evident only in the closing lines (p. 348), where Neptune prescribes the ceremonies and festivals to be held henceforth in honor of the god. There shall be Bacchic orgies and dances, flowers of Venus' holy tree shall be

[34a] Now published in *MLN*, LXV (1950), 379-383.

[35] A search through some Renaissance handbooks on mythology—Boccaccio, *De genealogia deorum* (Venice, 1472), Lilio Gregorio Giraldi, *Opera*, 2 vols. (Basel, 1850), Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae* (Hanover, 1605)—as well as through the modern works of Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, and Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, brought no results.

[36] See Christ-Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 5th ed. (Munich, 1911), Part II, 1, p. 85.

[37] "Yo lo diré si con placer me escuchan,
Y me dan facultad que me divierta
Un poco del propósito empezado" (p. 324).

strewn, and the vapor of the slaughtered animals shall rise to heaven. The story itself, however, is told with much Spanish detail. The accent throughout is on the *deshonra* which Proteus' dignity has suffered. Therefore he has to be compensated by the new festival instituted for his *honra y alegría* (p. 348). Proteus and his father Oceanus behave like courtiers toward their king in approaching Neptune:

> Entró el prudente viejo con sus pasos
> Mesurados y mansos, encubriendo
> Gran parte del dolor que padecía.[38]
> Y en llegando a su rey puso en el suelo
> Las rodillas postrándose de pechos,
> Y en haciendo su justo acatamiento,
> Mandado levantar, en pie se puso.
> (Page 339)

Such a standard term for the Spanish king-courtier relation as *hacer merced* occurs four times (pp. 340, 342, 344, 346). Among those who come to him for counsel are various types, e. g., those who die

> Por alcanzar de reyes grandes cargos.
> (Page 341).

Towards the end of his plea Proteus tells Neptune

> Que no quiero saber ni entender nada,
> Ni quiero más apacentar tus monstruos,
> Ni quiero aprovecharme de mis artes,
> Sino andarme con los de baja suerte
> Entre los mas ruines de tu corte.
> (Page 342)

Besides the main sources, we must mention an isolated use of Martial, *De spectaculis*, 25 b. The passage in Martial ends with this pointed line of Leander to the waves:

> Parcite dum propero, mergite dum redeo.

Boscán did not fail to carry this conceit over into his poem (p. 356):

> ¡ Mientras que voy, o aguas, amansáos!
> ¡ Ahogáme después cuando volviere![39]

As to the extent of Boscán's mythological learning we must limit ourselves to simple enumeration in form of a catalogue.

---

[38] Observe the Renaissance feeling for *misura* and restraint.

[39] Noted by Jellinek, *op. cit.*, p. 15, and Menéndez y Pelayo, *op. cit.*, p. 347, but overlooked by Anthony A. Giuliano, *Martial and the Epigram in Spain in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Philadelphia, 1930), pp. 17-18. In the *Octava Rima* (stanzas 11-12, p. 427) are two passages possibly influenced by Claudian, *De nuptiis Honorii et Mariae*, lines 54 ff., 72ff. But as the Spanish critic points out (pp. 327-329), the resemblances are rather vague in one case and indirect—through Politian—in the other.

Mythological figures of the nether world: Pluto, Proserpina (Ceres), the Eumenides (Alecto, Tisiphone, and Megaera), Charon, the Parcae, the Harpies, Cerberus.

Olympian gods: Jupiter, Juno, Apollo, Neptune, Minerva, Venus (and Amor), Diana, Bacchus, Mars.

Gods of water, winds, woods, dawn and dusk: Oceanus, Proteus, Nereus, Tereus, Nymphs, Doris and Nereids, Cyrene, Climene, Clio, Beroe, Arethusa, Dryads, Fauns, Aeolus, the winds Boreas, Aquilo, Africus, Eurus, and Favonius, Aurora, and Tithonus.

Women beloved by gods: Clythia, Danae, Leda, Medusa, Melantho, Melanippe, Orithyia.

Other mythological and legendary figures: Cybele, Attis, Adonis, the giants Tityus and Salmoneus, Ixion, Atlas, Polyphemus, Orpheus and Eurydice, Castor and Pollux, Aristaeus.

The oracle of Delphi.

Roman gods: Lucina, Vertumnus.

Although Boscán found a good many of the mythological characters in his sources, he was nevertheless able to draw quite often on his own knowledge of classical mythology. Names too remote for his readers were replaced by others which he apparently considered more familiar Following the same practice of clarification, Boscán in some instances gives the plain names where his source offers a learned paraphrasis. On the other hand, the Spanish poet indulges sometimes in a moderate display of mythological learning. In not a few instances Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are the basis of his knowledge.

For the sake of completeness we mention an allusion to Achilles' love for Briseis combined with a terse summary of the *Iliad* (p. 294).[40] Boscán compares Leander's courage to that of Hector (p. 374) and his rashness, heedlessly disregarding the roaring waves, is contrasted with Palinurus, Aeneas' helmsman, who does not trust even a calm sea.[41]

There are two comparisons taken from the history of Greek fine arts. Boscán knows the legend of the painter Zeuxis who created the figure of a beautiful woman by combining the individual beauties of five girls from Croton. He compares Venus' beauty to that of Zeuxis' ideal woman in the *Octava Rima* (p. 432; not in Bembo). In the Petrarchan *Capitulo I* (pp. 386-389) he likens the problem of the painter who had

[40] "Decían otros: Por ésta fuera bueno,
No por Briséis desavenirse Aquiles
De Agamenon, y estarse así en su tienda
Cantando y lamentando sus congojas
Y dejando morir los tristes griegos
Debajo de la cruda espada de Hector."

[41] Page 369; Virgil, *Aeneid*, V, 848-851; in Boscán there is no specific reference to the Virgilian passage.

to portray the grief of Iphigenia's father, when she was sacrificed to Artemis at Aulis, to his own:

> queriendo . . . pintar los celos
> Como el mayor tormento en los amores.
> (Page 389)

The classical painter

> por no apocar del padre el llanto,
> Acordó de pintalle el buen maestro
> La cabeza cubierta con un manto.[42]
> (Page 388)

Likewise, in his own situation

> Faltó el pincel, faltaron las colores,
> Quedó de la labor vencida el arte
> Para un dolor tan grande entre dolores.
> (Page 389)

Boscán, with the same predilection for the episodic and the same consciousness of deviation from his main theme we have observed above,[43] relates the legend of Iphigenia's sacrifice with a genuine joy in story telling and elaborateness that goes far beyond the immediate requirements of the comparison. The narrative technique and style of the three pages is superior to most of Boscán's other writing. "Parece que una brisa venida de las playas de la antiguedad refresca nuestra frente cansada . . . del escolasticismo amoroso."[44] It is this episode that gives to the *Capítulo*, which otherwise deals conventionally with *cosas de palacio*, its modern touch, thus providing one more example for Boscán's cautious joining of traditionalism and modernism. Sonnet 85 (p. 217) celebrates Boscán's new pure love as a pure fire which descended from its sphere because the lover offered it an equally pure kindling material. He concludes, turning the primeval myth of Prometheus into his own domesticated world of virtuous love:

> Si este tal fuego hurtara Prometeo,
> Cuando quiso alegrar la mortal gente,
> Tuviera gran desculpa su deseo.

---

[42] The reflection of this famous painting by Timanthes can still be seen in the famous murals in the House of the Tragic Poet in Pompeii.

[43] In both cases, p. 324 and p. 384, he uses the verb *divertirse* in its original, etymological connotation.

[44] Menéndez y Pelayo, *op. cit.*, p. 311. On p. 309, note 1, he quotes passages from Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, XXXV, 36, Quintilian, *Institutionis Oratoriae*, II, 13, and Cicero, *Orator*, ch. 22, relating the legend. The last passage is closest to Boscán, not only, as he observes, because the name of the painter is not given, but also for parallelism in wording: "quondam illum luctum penicillo non posset imitari." Yet it cannot be proved that any of these passages was Boscán's direct source.

In a more appropriate fashion, in Sonnet 88 (p. 219) the stillness reigning on the peaks of Olympus symbolizes the quiet clarity of his new love:

El alto monte de Olimpo, do, se escribe
Que no llega a subir ningún nublado
Ni alcanza allá el furor apoderado
Del viento, por más chozas que derribe,
Sobre sus altas cumbres me recibe,
Por que allí esté seguro y sosegado
Un claro amor que el alma me ha ilustrado
Con la clara virtud que en mí concibe.

The familar antithesis of *armas y letras* serves to characterize the apogee of Athens and Rome in a passage which also reveals familiarity with the history of ancient oratory.[45]

Some literary *topoi* which came down from ancient literature also appear in Boscán's work. The concept of love as warfare is quite frequent and to be found not only in the poetry in the Italianate meters (pp. 176, 183), but also in the *coplas* (pp. 16, 21, 40, 51, 77, 112, 114, 115, 152). It is generally used in Latin poetry—e. g., Horace, *Odes*, I, vi, 17-19; Catullus, LXVI, 13; Tibullus, I, iii, 64; and particularly Propertius (ed. Hosius, Leipzig, 1922), I, vi, 29-30; II, i, 12-13, 43-46; II, xv, 3-6; III, v, 1-2; III, xx, 19-20. In Boscán the comparison is deprived of the sensuous qualities found in such a writer as Propertius.[46] The following from *Mar de Amor* is typical:

---

[45] Leander's

"decir tuvo más fuerza
Y pudo más de sólo poder poco
Que si fuera el mejor y el más ornado,
El más ardiente y copioso estilo,
Que fué el de cuantos fueron celebrados
En Roma y en Atenas en el tiempo
Que la dulce elocuencia competía
Con el furor de las lucientes armas" (p. 303).

[46] One phrase taken from the love-warfare imagery was imitated by Garcilaso and Cervantes. In the *Epístola a Mendoza* (p. 416) this metaphor occurs to describe his newly won happiness:

"El campo que era de batalla, el lecho
Ya es lecho para mí de paz durable:
Dos almas hay conformes en un pecho."

In Propertius, II, i, 43-46, we find:

"navita de ventis, de tauris narrat arator,
enumerat miles vulnera, pastor oves;
nos contra angusto versantes *proelia lecto*."

In a nonerotic sense the bed is *campo di battaglia* for the sleepless Petrarch (*Rime*, CCXXVI, *Sonetto* 190, lines 7-8):

"La notte affanno, e 'l ciel seren m'è fosco
E duro campo di battaglia il letto."

Herrera, commenting on Garcilaso's Sonnet XVII, line 8,

"Y duro campo de batalla el lecho,"

notes the parallel with Boscán, whereas El Brocense points out the Petrarchan

Y yo para me amparar
De la batalla que espero,
Métome en el mar de amar,
De do salgo a guerrear
Como cursado guerrero.
(Page 152)

Two classical motifs occurring in Boscán have been discussed by Señorita María Rosa Lida, the *ruiseñor* theme and that of the *Ciervo herido*.[47] The *ruiseñor* motif is translated from Virgil, *Georgics*, IV, 504, in *Leandro y Hero* (p. 337). The mythological name Philomela, has been replaced by the easily understandable *pajarilla* or, as Señorita Lida puts it, "los poetas españoles . . . destacan el aspecto naturalista en menoscabo del mitológico." Twice more the *ruiseñor* occurs, in the *Octava Rima* (p. 425) and in the *Epístola a Mendoza* (p. 419), but without any poetic elaboration. Boscán shows a little more originality in the image of the *ciervo herido*, which he introduces in the Proteus episode of *Leandro y Hero* (p. 347). He says of Proteus:

Y así los que necesidad tenían
De aprovecharse dél, hanle buscado
Como el herido ciervo busca el agua.

This simile represents a contamination of the image of the Psalms, comparing the Psalmist's thirst for God with the stag searching for water, and the Virgilian metaphor of Dido wounded by love with the deer hit by the huntsman (*Aeneid*, IV, 67 ff.). The image, in the form in which it was introduced by Boscán into Spanish literature, took root and had a rather fecund history in the poetry of the Golden Age, so that we can rightly speak of Boscán's "modesta gloria de precursor,"[48] adding the remark that the observed "contamination" of images is in complete harmony with Boscán's Christian humanism, which we have noted throughout this study.[49]

Boscán's contribution to Spanish humanism consists first of all in

lines. Finally the metaphor found its way into Cervantes, *Don Quijote*, I, ch. XLVI (ed. Rodríguez Marín, Clás. Cast., IV, p. 208), "... tendré ... y no por duro campo de batalla este lecho ... sino por cama blanda y tálamo dichoso"; see Garcilaso de la Vega, *Works*, ed. Hayward Keniston (New York, 1925), pp. 267-268. It is evident that the ancient erotic image made its fortune in the Petrarchan form, since its original pagan voluptuousness was not quite compatible with the mode of feeling of a Christian writer.

[47] María Rosa Lida, "El ruiseñor de las Geórgicas y su influencia en la lírica española de la edad de oro," *Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen*, XI (1938), 297-298, and "Transmisión y recreación de temas grecolatinos en la poesía lírica española," *RFH*, I (1939), 63.

[48] R. M. Lida, *RFH*, I (1939), 38.

[49] He uses the image once more in its Virgilian form in Sonnet 48 (p. 204):

"Como el ventor que sigue al ciervo herido ...
Así, señora, vos me habéis seguido."

the mere fact that he translated Musaeus' *Hero and Leander* and Virgil's Aristaeus legend combined with that of Orpheus and Eurydice, as he found them in *Georgics* IV. His translation of a play by Euripides was not published. Through his free and unencumbered attitude toward the originals he succeeded in rising above the status of the translator and made these legends a part of Spanish literature. His poem is the first short epic in Spain dealing with classical legendary matter.[50] The tragic aspect of the legend was akin to his own melancholy conception of love.[51] Together with Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, he can claim the credit for having founded the Spanish *epístola de cosas familiares* as a poetic genre, under the auspices of Horace, of course. To have opened up to Castilian literature two new genres inspired by the classics is no small merit in literary history.

Yet, more important than form is the substance of Boscán's humanism. He tries to create a classical atmosphere by imitating the more easily imitable features of classical poetry, mainly embellishing his work with mythological lore. But what we feel today as typically Hellenic in Musaeus, the straightforwardness, the simple plastic force of Musaeus' language, together with his sensualism of Hellenistic heritage, have not been carried over into Boscán's Castilian version. In compensation, Boscán sentimentalizes Musaeus' tersely told epic with psychological analyses in the style of the Ovidian *Heroides*. However, sentiments expressed in this Ovidian style of feeling are no longer those of a pagan priestess of Venus, but those of a Christian Renaissance lady. Glimpses of contemporary Spanish life and concepts are anachronistically evident here and there in the ancient story.

Finally, it seems pertinent to note that classical apparatus is almost entirely absent from Books I and II of Boscán's *Obras*, i. e., from his lyrical output. This is the more remarkable since Book II contains the lyric poetry in the Italianate meters.[52] This observation leads to the conclusion that classical antiquity was for Boscán still largely a world of learning and literary craftmanship, not yet fused with the sum total of his own life experience. He was attracted by its more epic objective

[50] Boscán is not mentioned in the introductory pages of the article by Frank Pierce, "The 'canto epico' of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *HR*, XV (1947), 1-48.

[51] Musaeus was one of the first Greek texts available in Spain, a circumstance which must have been at least a contributing factor in his choice of the epic for translation. Demetrius Ducas published it without Latin translation (Alcalá, 1514), and this text must have been studied in the Spanish universities. See Menéndez y Pelayo, *op. cit.*, p. 344, and Emile Le Grand, "Bibliographie hispanogrecque," in *Bibliographie hispanique* (New York, 1917), pp. 168-169.

[52] Book III contains: "La historia de Leandro y Hero," "Capítulos" I and II, "Epístola," "Epístola de Don Diego de Mendoza a Boscán" and the latter's "Respuesta," and the "Octava Rima." In the sixteenth-century editions a fourth book contains "Algunas poesías de Garcilaso." All four books form one volume.

forms and more specifically by the love story, most closely akin to his own theme, love. For him, imitation of the classics was one thing, a literary enterprise, singing of his own love, another. He molds his intimate experiences in the tradition of the *Cancioneros* (Book I) and in the imported forms of Petrarch (Book II). Only in two instances does Boscán succeed in merging the two separate streams of his literary activity. The *Epístola a Mendoza* is mainly of Horatian and Tibullian vintage, yet has at the same time the sincere ring of personal experience. In the two sonnets on the death of his friend Garcilaso he sees the short but glorious life of the soldier-poet with the eyes of Homer and expresses grief and consolation through a comparison with Achilles.

The humanism of Boscán's work could be called timid from a modern (Burckhardtian) point of view. It is far from presenting a radical departure from traditional sentiments and ideas. Never is there any, even potential, conflict between Christianity and humanism. Boscán's humanism appears as an almost gentle attempt to join the new with the traditional.

University of Pennsylvania

CIRCE'S SWINE: PLAYS BY GORKY AND O'NEILL

HELEN MUCHNIC

WHEN in *The Odyssey* the companions of Odysseus are changed by Circe into swine, they are not deprived of human consciousness; but in Milton's reworking of the episode in *Comus* the men are transformed so thoroughly that they have lost all notion of what has happened to them, and are completely brutish and contented in their pleasures. Milton, that is, in a way consistent with the severity of Puritanism, changed the pathos of a state in which human beings suffer from a sense of their depravity into the greater moral tragedy of a condition so depraved as to make such suffering impossible.[1] Eugene O'Neill's *The Iceman Cometh* and Maxim Gorky's *The Lower Depths* are, it seems to me, a modern instance of much the same contrast. But, although a comparison of these two plays seems clearly indicated, the fullest one that I have seen so far is but a brief discussion in the Russian journal *Zvezda*;[2] there, in the course of a long, and generally scornful, article on current American literature, Vladimir Rubin concludes that, "If Gorky's play asserts: 'Man—that has a proud sound,' then O'Neill's *The Iceman Cometh* seems to be saying: 'Man—that has a low and infamous sound,' " for "the gloomy moral" of his play "debases man infinitely . . . as a pitiful, will-less toy of fate." It marks, he says, "the final 'spiritual capitulation' of this veteran of American drama." This, of course, is the opinion one would expect from Soviet criticism today; and there is, to be sure, a shade of truth in it. By comparison with Gorky's view of man, O'Neill's is indeed a pessimistic one. But this shadowy truth dismisses with too casual a brutality the realms of concepts here involved. The whole matter is deeper and of a different order than that indicated by Mr. Rubin's remarks.

On the face of it, the plays are very much alike, not only in setting, plot, and structure, but in aesthetic conception; for they seem to be, and yet are not, "slices of life." They are, more accurately, parables of life; and the social outcasts who people Harry Hope's "cheap ginmill of the five-cent whiskey, last-resort variety" and the "cellar, resembling

[1] This comparison was made some years ago by Marjorie Nicolson in one of her lectures at Smith College.

[2] Aug. 1948, p. 200.

a cave," owned by Kostilev, are not, despite the naturalism of their portraiture, pictures of real men, but symbolic figures in a parable on man's fate. As such they are exceptionally well chosen; the "dregs" of society, as the mark of extreme failure, are distress signals which urge inquiry into the nature of human disaster and the responsibility for it. Both plays are plays of dialogue rather than action, and what is done in them, reversing the usual method of drama, is an illustration of what is said. In each, a group of individuals, loosely bound together by a familiarity which breeds tolerant indifference and boredom and with enough in common to represent mankind by and large, is confronted by a solitary outsider who considers himself, and is considered by the group, to be superior—to this extent, at least, that he is in a position to preach and to exhort them to a new way of life. In both plays this solitary individual is the repository of a "truth" unknown to the others, and in both, after a brief show of impressive authority, he leaves the scene of his activities in the same, or somewhat worse, condition than he had found it. Is the joke, then, on him? Are the tables turned? Is the prophet false, or at any rate, inadequate? And are the benighted souls whom he had tried to save in possession of a reality which his supposedly superior wisdom has not touched? Who, then, is better, and who is right? Who is to be blamed for the melancholy outcome of events, the prophet or those who refuse to become his disciples? The plays strike deep, deeper than their spoken arguments concerning the nature of truth and the value of illusion. Implicit in them are comparisons between theories of life and actual living, between idealism and reality: demands exacted by the mind and those made by the body, hope imposed by the spirit and the limits to hope set by the circumscribed potentialities of man; questions about the nature and the power of the will; and a search for an ethics that might be accepted as both just and possible in a human situation that is seen to be desperate. But here, with the kind of questions posed and the way they are examined, the similarities end. The answers given are amazingly different, and as one studies them one becomes aware that even the questions are not so similar as at first supposed.

Each play is constructed around a central character, and its meaning hinges on the interpretation of this man and of what he preaches, for he comes with a well-defined faith to correct his fellows; it is to him that they are constrained to respond individually and as a group, it is on him that thoughts and emotions converge. He is, in short, a test of moral principles, and the spectator must decide to what degree he should respect and trust him. In their natures, the two characters are entirely different. Gorky's Luke is a wanderer who, not from any newly found faith but from an accumulated store of sanctified dogma, hands out good

advice wherever he happens to be to whoever will listen to him. He clucks sympathetically over men's complaints, tells little moral tales by way of illustrating his precepts, and, when the wretches he has been "saving" are drawn into a perilous situation and he himself is in danger of being caught and questioned by the authorities, slips out unperceived; for, with all his show of self-effacing, greathearted sympathy, he is not unmindful of his own safety—and he happens to be traveling without a passport. Hickey, on the other hand, enters with a program of reform, determined to make his friends happy, now that he himself has found happiness; and until the end, when he becomes a self-convicted felon, he has been a respected member of society. Nor is his scheme a ready-made concoction of untested, pious maxims; his recipe is drastic, and he has first tried it on himself. In the case of Hickey, there is no question of hypocrisy, but there is in the case of Luke.

When *The Lower Depths* was first performed in 1902, Luke was presented as a saintly character, and the play was interpreted as a lesson in brotherly love. That had not been Gorky's intention, as he himself explained in interviews at the time and in an article of 1933 in which—having described four types of "consolers," the sincere (an extremely rare variety), the professional, the vain, and finally "the most dangerous, clever, well-informed, and eloquent" of them all, the coldhearted men who cared about nothing so much as their own peace and comfort and consoled only because they could not be bothered with complaints—he declared that Luke belonged in the last division. "In our days," he added, "the consoler can be presented on the stage only as a negative and comic figure."

Gorky had intended Satin to be the real hero, but muffed the effect by leaving him off stage in some of the crucial moments of the play. Satin is in every respect at opposite poles from Luke, whom he appraises with his native acumen and honest incivility. "Pulp for the toothless" he calls him, but admits that in theory, at least, the wanderer has the right idea about man: namely, that man is large and free and must not be hampered. Satin, who sneers when he is sober and is eloquent when drunk, who is not apart from but very much of the group, on the spot when he is needed, sensible, and, above all, realistic in his understanding of what his fellowmen can and cannot do, has an undemonstrative, genuine sympathy which is infinitely more valuable than Luke's facile, softhearted, self-protecting kindliness. "You know how to do better than pity," Kleshch says to him, "you know how not to insult." And his rhetorical speech about man, which begins, "What is man? It is not you, not I, not they . . . no! It is you, I, they, the old man, Napoleon, Mahommed . . . all in one! Do you understand? It is—immense . . .," is the culminating point of the play and the one that states its meaning.

From Satin's standpoint Luke's pampering consolations, when they are not positively harmful—as in the case of the Actor, for whose suicide Satin holds the old man responsible—are insulting to man.

In *The Iceman Cometh* Satin's counterpart is Larry, "the only occupant of the room," according to the stage directions, "who is not asleep" when the curtain goes up, and who indeed remains terribly wide awake throughout the play, who speaks "sardonically," with "a comical intensity," considers himself aloof from all human affairs, "in the grandstand of philosophical detachment," but cannot help responding to the sufferings of "the breed of swine called men" with a sensitiveness and passion he would gladly suppress. He is discriminating and stern in his judgments and penetrating in his grasp of motives. He is not given to long pronouncements, does not try to influence men, but his influence is felt in what he is and in what he makes people do when they compel him to direct them; and, when he talks, it is with the aptness, wit, and brevity of poetry: "their ships will come in, loaded to the gunwales with cancelled regrets and promises fulfilled and clean slates and new leases"; "when man's soul isn't a sow's ear, it will be time enough to dream of silk purses"; and it is he who finds the right name for the Iceman, when he calls him the Iceman of Death. At the beginning of the play he makes a little speech that could be taken as the theme song of both *The Iceman Cometh* and *The Lower Depths*:

> What's it matter if the truth is that their favoring breeze has the stink of nickel whiskey on its breath, and their sea is a growler of lager and ale, and their ships are long since looted and scuttled and sunk on the bottom? To hell with the truth! As the history of the world proves, the truth has no bearing on anything. It's irrelevant and immaterial, as the lawyers say. The lie of a pipe dream is what gives life to the whole misbegotten mad lot of us, drunk or sober.

The "pipe dream" is the obvious leitmotif of *The Iceman Cometh*, as it is also that of *The Lower Depths*, the real theme of which, according to a splendid analysis by the Soviet critic Iury Iuzovsky,[3] is the question "What is Truth?" The characters of Gorky's play, this writer points out, are divided into well-marked groups with respect to the kind of truth they believe in: those, like the Actor, Pepel, Natasha, and Nastya, for whom illusion is truth; those, on the contrary, who believe only in the "truth of facts," like Bubnov, Kleshch, and the Baron, all of whom delight in pricking, variously, the bubble of man's hope—Bubnov with quiet satisfaction, Kleshch with bitterness, the Baron with a kind of sensual delight, "sneering out of envy," as Luke says of him; and, lastly, Luke and Satin who belong to neither category, and whose position Iuzovsky explains by a reference to Lenin's article, "What Is

[3] Iuzovsky, Iury, *Dramaturgia Gor'kovo*, Chast' I (Moscow-Leningrad, 1940), pp. 61-161.

To Be Done?"—written in the same year as Gorky's drama. "One must day-dream," says Lenin in this article, and, quoting the nineteenth-century nihilist critic, Pisarev,

> My day-dream may be of such a kind as to catch up with the natural course of events, or it may go off completely at a tangent to where the natural course of events can never arrive. In the first instance, the day-dream does no harm; it may even support and strengthen the energy of toiling mankind . . . In such day-dreams there is nothing that can prevent or paralyse the strength of workers . . . When there is a point of contact between the day-dream and life, then everything is going well . . .

comments that of the latter kind of day dream there is unfortunately too little in his time. *The Lower Depths*, says Iuzovsky, seems to give symbolic form to this distinction; for, in the difference between Luke's day dream and Satin's, the one of the principle of slavery, the other of freedom, the one leading to a dead end, the other opening a way out, we have the very distinction which Pisarev had noted.

Nevertheless, whether they believe anything or not, the inhabitants of *The Lower Depths* retain, as individuals, a sense of their humanity and they suffer because of it; Circe has not deprived them of consciousness, and, even though they do not do very much, they retain the possibility of action. With the frequenters of Harry Hope's saloon the case is different. They are contented enough in their sodden stupor and are miserable only when, for a brief space, they are jerked into consciousness, for this robs their liquor of its potency to "paralyze." Once they are made to face themselves, the good-natured Americans, thrown into inward conflict by the sudden demonstration that their long-cherished beliefs about themselves are lies, become acrimonious and belligerent; the Russians, even the "romantic" ones, had been too sober and too unhappy from the start for any kind of pretense of mutual regard and general affability. In both plays, it would seem, amicable relations can exist only on the superficial basis of convenient indifference, the "live and let live" philosophy of those who have not chosen, but have been driven, to live together. The Russians have, indeed, much less sense of group solidarity than the Americans; all but wholly unaware of one another and much more callous, they appear to have theories about society but little capacity or desire for social living.

The real difference between the characters in the two plays, however, is not that of social relationships but of the kind of illusion they cherish and the nature of the "truth" they are invited to adopt. If both plays can be said to deal with illusion and reality, these terms have different meanings for their authors. "Truth" or "reality" for Gorky is not a metaphysical but a humanist concept; it involves not so much a recognition of that which is or may be, immutably, as of that which may or

may not be done at a given moment. Freedom of will is here based simply on a practical view of possibilities. O'Neill's position is more sophisticated and complex; for him there is no distinction between useful and useless illusions, and no naive presentation of men as fully expressed by their beliefs. From an objective point of view, the "pipe dreams" here are all useless, but all are tragically inescapable and necessary to those who hold them; they are drawn not from the human consciousness of Circe's victims, nor from their idealistic hopes, but from painful, suppressed memories, the persistent iteration of recurrent images in troubled dreams. Here every man has been involved in something he wants to forget. Circe has helped him to oblivion, and the one real victory of his life is his capacity to forget. These men—all but one—unlike Gorky's, do not complain of the miserable state they are in. Parritt, the notable exception, commits suicide. The men of *The Lower Depths* are vaguely aware of some great solution to existence which they have not yet discovered, and the play exhorts them to seek a way that will lead them to discover it; those of *The Iceman Cometh* have no thought of anything beyond their individual well-being, which by now has been reduced to the form of drunken senselessness, and the play turns out to be a study of the impossibility of getting at the truth, indeed, a warning of the danger of going after it.

It is in keeping with this condition that the "leaders" differ as they do—that the American "prophet" is a salesman, peddling salvation as he peddles wash boilers, required to persuade a sales-resisting audience of the usefulness of his product, while the Russian is a wandering holy man, who preaches and consoles, leading despairing men who are only too ready to believe him along the path of human kindness, soothing them with assurances that their dreams are attainable. Both men are evil, Gorky's shrewdly and irresponsibly, O'Neill's, even in his noxiously commonplace sentimentality, rather pathetically and goodheartedly; for, whereas Luke's words are words only, Hickey is disastrously involved in what he preaches. Comically enough, neither accomplishes what he sets out to do—comically, because our sympathies are not with them. If the tone of the plays is on the whole tragic, the tragedy inheres not in the doom of the central characters but in the pathos of various episodes, and even more in implications, in what is not, rather than in what is, done or said. But if Luke and Hickey fail as prophets, it is not because they have misunderstood the values by which their audiences live—a passion for faith on the one hand, a desire for individualistic self-assertion on the other. Nor is it these premises, but something else, that is proved false in their failure.

What is at issue in Gorky's play is the relative usefulness—and *usefulness* is here the same as ultimate good—of two ideals: one, the

Christian ideal of tender, pitying humility and inactive faith, the other, the materialist doctrine of forceful, self-reliant, practical action. In O'Neill's play the issue is the nature rather than the practicability of ideals. Social activity is the sphere of Gorky's thought, self-knowledge of O'Neill's. Though both are concerned with happiness, in *The Lower Depths* happiness is looked on as derivative, dependent on an intellectual grasp of values: let a man become conscious of his dignity and capacity, let him adopt an ideal which is possible for man, and he will realize it as an individual. In *The Iceman Cometh* happiness is seen to be immediate and primary; larger concepts may be valid only as abstract formulations of what men have done: let a man believe only what he has achieved—otherwise he will be ridiculous, self-deceived, and dangerous. The reason Luke fails is that he is neither serious nor honest in his relations with men; but Hickey fails because, in his desire to rouse Circe's victims to their original status as human beings with insight into themselves, he has attempted the impossible, for most of them cannot be roused, and those who can will kill themselves once they have understood what they are. Gorky's "message" is seriously meant as a program of conduct; O'Neill's is a poetic statement of disaster, presented only for the contemplation of those who care to look below the surface of human activity.

Murder is central to both plays; but in *The Lower Depths* it is accidental, based on passion, and is generally conceded to be regrettable, while in *The Iceman Cometh* it is more or less premeditated, rationalized to appear as an act of love, and is not a mere episode but the essence of the play. In fact, *The Iceman Cometh*, the latest of O'Neill's inquiries into the paradoxes of existence, is a prophecy of doom, of the willful and calculated murder by man of what he thinks he loves, a revelation of his unconscious hatreds and desire for death. Always concerned with illusion, O'Neill has presented it in many ways: in pictures of individuals pathetically or tragically frustrated because of some initial mistake they make about themselves or that others make about them, as in *Bound East for Cardiff*, *Before Breakfast*, *The Rope*, *Beyond the Horizon*, *The Straw*, and *Different*; in symbols not of individuals but of man overwhelmed by the force of unconscious primitivism latent in him, as in *The Emperor Jones* and *The Hairy Ape*; in parables concerning the ethics of Western civilization, as in *The Fountain*, *Marco Millions*, and *Lazarus Laughed*; or in psychological probings of man's soul, as in *Desire under the Elms*, *The Great God Brown*, *Strange Interlude*, and *Mourning Becomes Electra*. Despite great variation in focus and interest, certain factors remain constant enough throughout the plays to make O'Neill's work appear as a continuous philosophic investigation of the riddle of falsehood at the core of life, in the process

of which several partial solutions have been reached, but no definitive one as yet. His plays are eerie with the ghosts of terrible dissatisfactions and of desperate guilt; and their darkness is hardly relieved by a hovering conviction that there is power in love and that an ultimate beneficent grandeur exists beyond the groping and raging consciousness of man, for it is in tragedy itself that men are shown to have attained their desires. Jones, in death, preserves the magnificent isolation he had wanted; Yank, in the brotherhood of monkeys, "belongs" at last; Ephraim Cabot's desolate farm is still "jim-dandy"; Lavinia Mannon, who has dedicated herself to the punishment of a wrong, shuts herself away from life as the final phase of her life work—and so on. In an ironic way, death and suffering are always the price of attainment, while back of this human scene is "an infinite, insane energy which creates and destroys without other purpose than to pass eternity in avoiding thought," and is sometimes called God. A primitive, necessary, unthinking, intangible essence that insures perpetuity is shown to exist in opposition to the will of man, who desires extinction. "We're always desiring death for ourselves or others," says Nina Leeds. "Our lives are merely strange dark interludes in the eternal display of God the Father!"

The Iceman Cometh, perhaps more clearly than any of the other O'Neill plays, is a morality play, a variation on the ancient motif of the Dance of Death, with its modern, paradoxical twist of willed chance and desired catastrophe, where each man kills the thing he loves because he feels guilty of his inability to love enough. Harry Hope's saloon is Everywhere, and the men in it are drowning a secret guilt they cannot understand. Gorky's outcasts, on the other hand, are boldly, openly immoral; they admit the crimes they have committed and are not ashamed of them, for their crimes, being offenses not against themselves but against something hateful outside themselves, have, in a way, the aspect of righteous vengeance. The depths to which they have sunk are only social depths; what troubles them is a sense not of guilt but of inadequacy, and to find truth is their only salvation. But O'Neill seems to be saying that to live at all man must live on a lie, for the reward of truth is death. Gorky's man can live only by facing himself, O'Neill's cannot live if he faces himself.

The theme of O'Neill's play is not really the difference between illusion and reality, but the difference between two realities: one the reality of belief, the other the reality of the unrecognized and unacknowledgeable forces of existence. Between illusion and reality a man might choose, but O'Neill's two realities are not open to choice; they are related to each other in a fashion so tortuous as to elude consciousness. A man feels and believes the very opposite of what he thinks he feels and believes. And the reason for this is that the ununderstandable

necessity to live has imposed on him a habit of unconscious lying; he reiterates a faith in his will to live, in the great capacity and need of love which animates his life, whereas actually his desire is to die and the motivating force of his life is not love but hate. In short, the two realities which inform man's existence are so profoundly contradictory that consciousness must either pass them by, or deal with them in falsehoods, or obliterate itself. Man is, by definition, a deluded being. Thus the poor, harmless souls at Harry Hope's—good-natured, easygoing, and rather appealing with their vague beliefs in love and honor so long as they remain in their drunken stupor—exhibit, as soon as they are forced to consciousness, unsuspected, deep-seated, murderous hatreds. What Hickey's truth brings to light is that everything that seems good covers up basic evil: Hope, whose life of inactivity is postulated on the premise that he is mourning the death of Bessie whom he loved, suddenly finds himself calling her "that nagging bitch"; Jimmy Tomorrow, who thinks he has been drowning his sorrow at Marjorie's defection, admits, to his own surprise, that he never wanted her; Parritt is forced to acknowledge not only that he is guilty of virtual matricide but that this murder was caused by his hatred of his mother; and, as a piece of final irony, Hickey, in the very process of a touching disquisition on his lasting and passionate love of Evelyn, inadvertently blurts out: "You know what you can do with your pipe dream now, you damned bitch!"

In Gorky's view, what men need more than anything is a belief by which to steer their actions, but for O'Neill beliefs are irrelevant to both morality and happiness. Man is born guilty—O'Neill's attempt to rid himself of Puritanism seems to have brought him round to a metaphysical confirmation of its basic tenets—and the more he tries to clear himself of guilt the more entangled he becomes in it. For how shall the kind of truth which consciousness reveals be met except by death? What price life, O'Neill is asking, and is not genial enough to congratulate man on escaping destruction by the skin of his teeth; for, to his severe scrutiny of man, the death wish seems to have moral justification. The last of all illusions is that ideals are something other than Janus-faced inventions, distressing and comforting by turn, without reference to anything beyond themselves other than the reality of man's having to get through his life somehow. In earlier plays there had been a gentler note. "Do not wound me with wisdom," said the wise Kublai of *Marco Millions*, "Speak to my heart!" But now, how shall the heart be spoken to when it has forgotten the only language by which it can be addressed, when all poetic vision has been lost, the great unanalyzable substratum of experience has been given over to dissection, love and hate have become indistinguishable, and the pursuit of

happiness has ended not in enjoyment but in oblivion? Gorky's men are more unhappy than O'Neill's, but not so lost.

The essential difference in the two situations is perhaps best embodied in the real heroes of the plays: Satin, ruthless in his appraisal of individual failings but with a native respect for humanity and an ardent faith in its grandeur, and Larry, whose cynical philosophy is coupled with an instinctive sympathy of which he is ashamed, and whose sense of justice is based on a hopeless understanding of human beings. With these characters, it seems to me, their authors are identified: Gorky with the man of action, closely involved in the fate of his fellows, but more clear-eyed, farseeing, and confident than they, and able, therefore, to inspire them by a persuasive vision of their strength; O'Neill with the Grandstand Foolosopher, whose function it is to look unsquintingly on man's depravity and, when called upon, to discharge the unwelcome task not of judging men but of letting them pass judgment on themselves. The high point of Satin's act is a stirring speech on man, of Larry's, his waiting by the window to hear the sound of Parritt throwing himself from the fire escape (for Larry's finest deed is to free a man of guilt by driving him to suicide)—just as the purpose of Gorky's life was to stir men to action, and the function of O'Neill's has been to make them aware of the full meaning of the evil that is in them.

This contrast, to my mind, cannot be fully explained by the fact that O'Neill has long been preoccupied with Roman Catholicism, into which he was born, while Gorky was always an agnostic; for these titles of belief may point to tendencies of thinking and perceiving but can neither describe nor account for an artist's original view of life. Some might say that O'Neill's sophisticated, puritanical condemnation of man has proved to be a wise commentary on Gorky's naive Homeric pity, history having shown that it is better for men to mope in harmless inactivity than to follow a leader whose promises fail to take account of the nature of human motives, and that Circe's brutes had better be changed back to men before being urged to action. But to say this would be to disregard both the complexity of historical events and the kinds of plays we are here considering: one of them has as its aim to state a temporary ethical problem affecting men in an unsatisfactory society which might be changed; the other, to scrutinize the eternal dilemma of how conscious man is related to unconscious nature—aims so divergent as to make these two samples of Western art in the twentieth century almost as dissimilar as those produced by the cultures of Byzantium and of ancient Greece.

Smith College

UN THÈME DES ROMANCIERS NATURALISTES: LA MATRONE D'ÉPHÈSE

G. HAINSWORTH

LA MATRONE D'ÉPHÈSE de Pétrone—histoire d'une veuve éplorée qui se donne à un soldat dans le tombeau même de son mari—avec sa variante "chinoise" qui comporte la résurrection du mari et la punition de l'épouse infidèle, est un thème des plus répandus dans la littérature et dans le folklore. Eduard Grisebach, dans la monographie qu'il y consacrait dès 1872,[1] s'occupait surtout de l'aspect folklorique de la question, s'attachant à établir l'origine "indienne" de ce thème et la supériorité morale des versions orientales et allemandes. Nous nous proposons d'examiner un certain nombre de textes français de l'époque 1869-93, non mentionnés par Grisebach,[2] et qui se rattachent tous, plus ou moins directement, à la *Matrone d' Éphèse*.

Dans une certaine mesure, bien entendu, nous allons remuer dans ce qui suit des questions de sources. Mais en même temps et surtout nous chercherons, par l'étude minutieuse d'un certain nombre de *fragments* se ressemblant par la donnée, à dégager, sur les auteurs en question—Flaubert, Maupassant, Daudet, Alexis—les éléments d'un jugement de valeur relevant le moins possible de l'impression et de la généralisation.

D'autres thèmes, qu'il serait facile de signaler, auraient pu servir également de point de départ et nous auraient conduit vraisemblablement à des conclusions analogues. Celui que nous avons choisi, sorte de triangle un peu spécial, débordant d'un côté sur la vaste question des deuils et des lits de mort en général, et de l'autre, sur ce thème plus abstrait de "l'amour et la mort" étudié par Mario Praz,[3] a l'avantage de présenter une matière à la fois étoffée et assez précise, susceptible de tenir en quelques pages.

Il n'est pas nécessaire de chercher, pour la plupart de ces textes

[1] Nous avons employé l'édition suivante: *Die Wanderung der Novelle von der treulosen Witwe durch die Weltliteratur* (Berlin, 1886).

[2] Pour la littérature française, Grisebach ne donne rien de plus récent que *la Coupe et les lèvres* (Acte IV). En plus des textes que nous citerons dans ce qui suit, il faut ajouter notamment à la bibliographie de Grisebach: Marcassus, *la Clorymene* (Paris, J. Quesnel, 1626), pp. 274-291; Méry, *Une Veuve inconsolable* (roman) (1846); Tchekhov, *l'Ours* (pièce en un acte).

[3] *The Romantic Agony* (Oxford, 1933). Du reste, Praz n'examine aucun des textes dont il sera question ici.

français,[4] d'autre archétype que Pétrone, dont le style et le point de vue avaient de quoi plaire à la génération de Flaubert, comme aux décadents plus tard. Ce court récit de la *Matrone d'Éphèse* est du reste trop connu pour qu'il soit utile de l'analyser ici. On y a affaire à une étude de psychologie féminine en miniature, annonçant jusqu'à un certain point, par la tendance générale, telle œuvre moderne dans le genre d'*Un Cœur simple, l'Assommoir* (Gervaise), *Intimité*, et accusant cette sorte de déterminisme anti-héroïque qui passe auprès des optimistes pour du pessimisme.[5]

Flaubert, qui fait souvent allusion à Pétrone, songeait vers la fin de sa vie à écrire "une sorte de *Matrone d'Éphèse* moderne" dont l'idée lui serait venue en écoutant un récit de Tourguéneff.[6] Faut-il identifier ce récit de l'auteur russe avec celui qu'on trouve rapporté dans le *Journal* des Goncourt, année 1876,[7] au sujet de certaine bonne fortune dans un cimetière à Lucerne? De toute façon, la nature exacte du projet flaubertien nous échappe.

Mais déjà dans l'*Éducation sentimentale*, l'épisode de la mort de Dambreuse et le rôle joué à ce moment-là par Mme Dambreuse et par Frédéric[8] ne se rattachent-ils pas par certains côtés à la *Matrone d'Éphèse*? Cet épisode, qui n'a pas à première vue valeur symbolique qu'on peut attribuer à d'autres scènes du roman (comme par exemple à celle qui lui fait pendant, la mort du fils de Frédéric[9]), rentre bien, avec les pages suivantes (funérailles de Dambreuse et description du Père-Lachaise), dans le plan général du roman: illusions et béotisme congénitaux de l'humanité, marche destructrice du temps, inutilité de tout effort. Il est d'ailleurs évident que, dans la mesure où il s'y agit simultanément d'amour et de mort, cet épisode coïncide avec une des tendances fondamentales de Flaubert.

Dressons un rapide schéma des pages en question, après avoir rappelé que Frédéric est déjà l'amant de Mme Dambreuse (elle s'est donnée à lui "par ennui surtout," tandis que Frédéric l'a recherchée "parce qu'elle était noble . . . riche . . . dévote"; maintenant, après coup, Mme Dambreuse voudrait que leur liaison devienne "un grand amour," et Frédéric, déçu par les appas de sa maîtresse, croit voir en elle quelqu'un d'utile pour sa carrière):

[4] Il se peut qu'Alexis et Hugues Le Roux (*la Sentinelle*) s'inspirent du folklore breton.

[5] Pour E. V. Marmorale (*Petronio*, Naples, 1936), qui considère Pétrone comme un moraliste, la *Matrone d'Éphèse* ne serait en rien une parodie de Virgile. Nous croyons personnellement que ce récit peut très bien passer pour une version *rosse* des amours de Didon et d'Énée.

[6] Maupassant, *Œuvres posthumes*, II (Conard, 1930), 125.

[7] Vol. V (Paris, Bibl. Charpentier, 1912), pp. 276-277.

[8] Conard (1923), pp. 537-544.

[9] Pp. 574-578; aussi pp. 583-584 (rappel de la mort de Dambreuse).

(1) Dambreuse, sortant de maladie, déclare qu'il aurait pu mourir. "Pas sans moi!" s'écrie Mme Dambreuse. Sans répondre, Dambreuse regarde sa femme et Frédéric, d'un œil énigmatique. Quelques jours plus tard, voilà Dambreuse alité de nouveau, et sa femme (qui tient surtout à hériter et à écarter la concurrence de Cécile, fille naturelle de Dambreuse, mobiles que Frédéric ne devine pas d'abord) ne le quitte plus d'un pas:

Les personnes qui se faisaient inscrire chez le concierge s'informaient d'elle avec admiration;[10] et les passants étaient saisis de respect devant la quantité de paille qu'il y avait dans la rue, sous les fenêtres.

(2) Après avoir mentionné la confession du malade, avec Mme Dambreuse qui regarde "de loin, curieusement," l'auteur évoque dans son ensemble la scène dans la chambre à coucher, en insistant sur des détails auditifs qui servent de transition à l'agonie: "Enfin, un râle s'éleva . . . il exhala un petit souffle *en même temps qu'il tournait les yeux*, et la tête retomba *de côté* sur l'oreiller." (Les allusions aux yeux de Dambreuse, ici et ailleurs, présentent de l'importance pour l'épisode entier: Dambreuse a vu clair dans le caractère et dans les desseins de sa femme et s'est procuré une vengeance posthume en testant en faveur de Cécile.) Donc, "avec la simplicité du devoir," Mme Dambreuse ferme les paupières de son mari. "Puis elle écarta les deux bras, en se tordant la taille comme dans le spasme d'un désespoir contenu." Elle regagne sa chambre, suivie peu après par Frédéric.

(3) A une impression du boudoir de Mme Dambreuse succède un long développement, moitié conversation, moitié narration, dans lequel des précisions sur l'état de fortune des Dambreuse viennent se placer au beau milieu d'une oraison funèbre analogue à celle que Béline prononce sur Argan. Cette exécution de Dambreuse, comme de sa fille naturelle ("jalouse, intéressée, hypocrite"), sert ici à mettre Mme Dambreuse à nu devant Frédéric et à délimiter singulièrement, pour le lecteur et même pour Frédéric, le sens qu'il faut attribuer au point culminant de la scène:

Elle se leva, se mit doucement sur ses genoux.—Toi seul es bon! Il n'y a que toi que j'aime! En le regardant, son cœur s'amollit, une réaction nerveuse lui amena des larmes aux paupières, et elle murmura:—Veux-tu m'épouser?

Du reste, lorsqu'il consent, Frédéric pense surtout à l'argent, et ce curieux mélange d'hypocrisie et de sincérité se retrouve également dans la conclusion de cette partie:

Puis une pudeur le prit et, pour faire au défunt une sorte de réparation, il s'offrit à le veiller lui-même. Mais comme il avait honte de ce pieux sentiment,

[10] Cf. Pétrone: "Tam notae erat pudicitiae, ut vicinarum quoque gentium feminas ad spectaculum sui evocaret . . . Singularis exempli femina."

il ajouta d'un ton dégagé :—Ce serait peut-être plus convenable.—Oui, peut-être bien, dit-elle, à cause des domestiques.

(4) Frédéric rejoint la religieuse et le prêtre ("grand homme maigre, l'air espagnol et fanatique") auprès du mort. Il se met à regarder Dambreuse, ce qui amène une description de celui-ci ("visage jaune comme de la paille," "coins de sa bouche," "foulard . . . gilet . . . crucifix"), suivie du résumé de sa carrière en un paragraphe qui renferme comme la quintessence du roman ("Elle était finie, cette existence pleine d'agitations . . ."). Il est question ensuite de la fortune qu'il a laissée (énumération de propriétés immobilières) et, toujours sous une forme concrète, des châteaux en Espagne bâtis par Frédéric. Flaubert nous ramène alors au cadavre :

Le prêtre qui venait à se moucher,[11] ou la bonne sœur arrangeant le feu, interrompaient brutalement ces imaginations. Mais la réalité les confirmait; le cadavre était toujours là.

L'auteur fait mention encore une fois des yeux et de l'expression de Dambreuse :

Ses paupières s'étaient rouvertes; et les pupilles, bien que noyées dans des ténèbres visqueuses,[12] avaient une expression énigmatique, intolérable. Frédéric croyait y voir comme un jugement porté sur lui . . . et il le considérait de plus près . . . en lui criant mentalement : "Eh bien, quoi? Est-ce que je t'ai tué?"

Une nouvelle évocation de la scène dans son ensemble ("prêtre . . . religieuse . . . mèches des trois flambeaux") et ensuite la notation des bruits qu'on entend dans la rue ("roulement sourd des charrettes . . . compagnie d'ânesses qui trottinaient . . . cris des vendeurs ambulants") terminent de façon symétrique l'épisode entier,[13] et servent en même temps de transition aux pages suivantes.

Il est évident que ce développement tout imprégné d'ironie rappelle par certains côtés la mort d'Emma avec les illusions de Charles sur son *amabilis conjux*. C'est, dans *Madame Bovary*, un thème se déployant avec plus de faste, plus riche en émotions simples, plus poétique. Cependant, sur son mode propre, cet épisode de l'*Éducation senti-*

[11] De même dans *Madame Bovary* : "Bournisien . . . se mouchait bruyamment" (Conard, 1921), p. 455.

[12] Cf. pour "ténèbres visqueuses" et pour "coins de sa bouche" mentionné plus haut, *Madame Bovary*, p. 454, où Flaubert nous oblige à "sentir matériellement" ces détails.

[13] "Roulement sourd" rappelle la paille mentionnée au début. Dans la première partie, à l'aide d'une série de notations surtout auditives, l'auteur évoque successivement la rue, la chambre à coucher, les personnages. Ici, il suit l'ordre inverse. —Les allusions à la rue (cf. *Madame Bovary*, p. 454 : "L'horloge de l'église sonna deux heures. On entendait le gros murmure de la rivière. . .") ont, bien entendu, leur valeur émotive dans cette scène de mort ("vendeurs ambulants," par exemple, a la force d'une allusion à Dambreuse).

mentale n'a pas moins de force, et il respire un pessimisme plus âpre et plus profond. Appeler l'attention sur l'éloquence de cette prose, ce travail qui s'acharne sur le concret et qui ruse pour en reproduire approximativement l'effet, ces qualités suggestives du style comme description et psychologie à la fois, ce groupement ironique de détails disparates, cet art des transitions et de la mise en valeur, avec l'extrême concision de certains traits, ce serait montrer que Flaubert est Flaubert. Mais s'il s'agit de préciser l'inspiration particulière de cet épisode, nous n'hésiterons pas à citer en premier lieu la *Matrone d'Éphèse*. Certes, les ressemblances matérielles sont peu nombreuses: le mort, la veuve et l'amant, certaines attitudes de la veuve, un projet de mariage; et les ressorts psychologiques ont été complètement transformés. Mais il semblerait justement, en dernière analyse, que Flaubert, pour bien marquer tout ce qui sépare le paganisme du *panmuflisme*, a eu l'audace de prendre systématiquement le *contre-pied* de Pétrone. Ainsi, Mme Dambreuse est *heureuse* de voir mourir son mari, elle l'a *déjà* trompé, et quant aux sentiments qu'elle inspire à Frédéric, celui-ci ne la désire même pas. C'est l'absence complète de tout mouvement instinctif, en bien ou en mal, et l'argent joue à peu près uniquement ici le rôle de constante. Si nous ajoutons que la présentation de Dambreuse comme une sorte de philosophe qui parvient à déjouer sa femme et l'amant, et que la mort même n'empêchera pas d'avoir le dernier mot, correspond dans une certaine mesure à ce qu'on trouve dans la version "chinoise,"[14] nous aurons suffisamment caractérisé les emprunts possibles de Flaubert à la légende traditionnelle.

Ferrère[15] a déjà signalé la ressemblance de ce texte avec la mort de Forestier dans *Bel-Ami* (I, 8). Le sujet du roman de Maupassant n'est que trop connu. Au point de vue de la forme, notons son début magistral et sa conclusion non moins vigoureuse. Mais bien que l'orientation générale, correspondant à l'élévation progressive du héros et à son évolution dans le sens d'un égoïsme raisonné, reste à peu près constante, le gros du livre semble accuser parfois une composition peu sûre. On ne comprend pas facilement, par exemple, la place importante accordée à cet assaut d'armes (pp. 370-385)—à moins qu'il ne faille y

[14] On a vu que l'auteur insiste sur l'expression de Dambreuse, dont les yeux se rouvrent. Cf. la version chinoise telle qu'elle figure, par exemple, dans *Zadig*, ch. II, où il est également question d'un testament.—En même temps, l'ironie de Dambreuse et sa vengeance posthume rappellent jusqu'à un certain point un épisode de *Madeleine Férat* (éd. Fr. Bernouard, pp. 257-270): De Rieu, sur son lit de mort, souriant avec ironie, fait de l'amant de sa femme, Tiburce, son légataire universel, à condition qu'il épouse Mme de Rieu; c'est là, étant donné le caractère de Tiburce, un arrêt de mort sur la pauvre femme.

[15] E. L. Ferrère, *L'Esthétique de Gustave Flaubert* (Paris, 1913), p. 255. Maupassant, *Bel-Ami* (Conard, 1928), pp. 264-292.

voir justement le symbole de ce *struggle-for-life* et de cette guerre des deux sexes qui forment la matière du roman— ou à ce rendez-vous dans l'église (pp. 397-412), tandis que certaines gauloiseries dans le genre de *Mots d'amour* (1882), *le Vengeur* (1883), *Décoré* (1884),[16] peuvent paraître déplacées. Chose plus grave à notre point de vue, la note lugubre donnée par la fameuse tirade de Norbert de Varenne (I, 6),[17] reprise dans l'épisode du duel (I, 7), et qui domine, nous allons le voir, dans le chapitre qui nous intéresse ici, c'est-à-dire dans le dernier chapitre de la première partie, ne se fait presque plus entendre dans le reste du roman. Maupassant a-t-il estimé—à tort ou à raison—que cette scène douloureuse, bien en vue à la fin de la première partie, était susceptible, à l'aide des remarques de Norbert de Varenne, dont un rappel se place ici même, de déteindre, pour ainsi dire, sur la seconde moitié du roman, et d'y projeter une ombre? En même temps, la mort de Forestier marquerait une étape dans la carrière du héros: Bel-Ami, qui a constamment rêvé d'épouser une femme comme Madeleine Forestier, se voit sur le point de réaliser cette ambition, dont la nature courte et terre-à-terre apparaîtra au cours de la seconde partie.

Cela se passe aux environs de Cannes, à l'entrée du printemps:

(1) Forestier sent les approches de la mort. "Combien est-ce que j'en verrai encore, de couchers de soleil? dit-il. Je ne verrai plus rien." Duroy pense à Norbert de Varenne et à ses remarques sur la mort, qui sont en partie textuellement reproduites. Le lendemain, Forestier croit constater une légère amélioration dans son état. Il se suppose guéri et, se promenant en voiture le long de la côte avec sa femme et son ami, il fait des projets d'avenir! En rentrant, il a une rechute[18] et, le lendemain matin, il est condamné par le médecin. On envoie chercher un prêtre.

(2) Forestier se confesse; sa voix presque imperceptible contraste avec celle du prêtre. Au moment où il va mentionner—paraît-il—Vaudrec, le "protecteur" de sa femme, Madeleine emmène Bel-Ami dans le jardin en disant: "Il ne faut pas écouter ses secrets." Il est question du parfum des fleurs et d'un papillon que l'auteur évoque de manière assez frappante. Après le départ du prêtre, Maupassant, qui

[16] Cf. *Bel-Ami*, pp. 430-433, 348-358 (textuellement), 503-505.

[17] "La vie est une côte . . . Lorsqu'on arrive en haut, on aperçoit tout d'un coup la descente et la fin qui est la mort." "Vivre, c'est mourir." "Essayez de vous dégager de tout ce qui vous enferme . . . de sortir vivant de votre corps." "Nous étions nés pour vivre davantage selon la matière (*c'est-à-dire avec l'inconscience des animaux*)." Ce sont là les thèmes schopenhaueriens développés par Norbert de Varenne (pp. 206-213). Notons que Bel-Ami n'aura qu'à croiser une femme dans la rue (p. 213) pour oublier aussitôt toutes ces idées tristes.

[18] Cf. Flaubert, première partie.

diffère en cela de Flaubert, fait parler assez longuement son mourant: "Sauve-moi! . . . Je ne veux pas mourir . . . Je ne verrai plus rien . . . Le cimetière, moi, mon Dieu!" Tels sont, avec répétitions et variations, les mouvements de désespoir que l'auteur attribue ici à Forestier. Ce qui a plus de poids, peut-être, dans cette section, c'est l'étude physiologique de l'agonie. Sans que les faits notés soient, et pour cause, bien neufs, Maupassant arrive souvent à mettre la main sur le détail spécial et qui fait voir.[19]

Enfin, les yeux de Forestier se ferment "comme deux lumières qui s'éteignent":[20]

> Un petit hoquet agita la gorge du mourant, et deux filets de sang apparurent *aux coins de sa bouche*, puis *coulèrent sur sa chemise*. Ses mains cessèrent leur hideuse promenade. Il avait fini de respirer.

Quant à Madeleine Forestier, on l'a vue plus haut fondre en larmes devant le désespoir de son mari, et puis, midi ayant sonné, elle a refusé de manger. Maintenant, "poussant une sorte de cri," elle s'abat "sur les genoux en sanglotant dans le drap."[21] Duroy se félicite que tout se soit terminé si vite.

(3) Après une transition plutôt faible, il est question de la veillée proprement dite. Au début, cela correspond approximativement à Flaubert: Bel-Ami regarde le cadavre et la réflexion, "C'était là son ami," amène une fois de plus un rappel des paroles de Norbert de Varenne, suivi des pensées de Bel-Ami lui-même sur la toute-puissance de la mort, la brièveté de la vie. Puis, se détournant de Forestier pour regarder Madeleine, Bel-Ami se laisse gagner par des idées plus riantes. "Voilà pourtant la seule bonne chose de la vie: l'amour!" songe-t-il.[22] Il se demande ce que Madeleine compte faire désormais; jusqu'à quel point peut-il espérer l'épouser à son tour? comment aborder ce sujet délicat? L'auteur développe longuement ces trois idées, dans un style plutôt alambiqué. Notons que Bel-Ami songe bien, en passant, au rôle équivoque joué par Vaudrec dans le ménage Forestier, et croit pouvoir attribuer à Madeleine une absence de préjugés qui la rend pa-

[19] "De grosses larmes coulaient de ses yeux sur ses joues *décharnées*; et les *coins maigres* de sa bouche se plissaient *comme ceux des petits enfants qui ont du chagrin*." "Ses mains commencèrent un mouvement continu, lent et régulier, *comme pour recueillir quelque chose sur les draps*" (détail mentionné trois fois et qui se trouvait également dans *Madame Bovary*, p. 446). "L'haleine de Forestier était plus rapide que *celle d'un chien qui vient de courir* . . ."

[20] "Ses yeux pâlissaient comme deux *globes de lampe* qui s'éteignent" (*Madame Bovary*, p. 448).

[21] Cf. Flaubert, fin de la section 2.

[22] Cette idée, déjà exprimée par Mme de Marelle (p. 123), était implicite dans les théories de Norbert de Varenne.

reille à lui-même.[23] Cependant il n'ose même pas s'avouer d'abord qu'il veut l'épouser, et l'auteur a l'air de poser en principe que Bel-Ami se conduirait en goujat s'il brusquait les choses.

Une allusion au silence de la chambre (où l'on n'entend que le tic-tac d'une pendule[24]) sert de transition à une conversation dans laquelle Bel-Ami cherche à sonder les intentions de Madeleine. Celle-ci se déclare "accablée," elle pousse de profonds soupirs. Lorsque Bel-Ami exprime son désir de lui être utile, elle laisse tomber sur lui "un de ces regards mélancoliques et doux qui remuent en nous jusqu'aux moelles des os" et, le remerciant, elle lui tend la main. Cette main, Bel-Ami la prend, et il se décide enfin à la baiser:

> Puis, quand il sentit que cette caresse d'ami allait devenir trop prolongée, il sut laisser retomber la petite main. Elle s'en revint mollement sur le genou de la jeune femme qui prononça gravement:—Oui, je vais être bien seule, mais je m'efforcerai d'être courageuse.

Bel-Ami reste perplexe: "Certes il ne pouvait pas le lui dire à cette heure, en ce lieu, devant ce corps . . . Le cadavre le gênait." Ici, à propos du cadavre, l'auteur insiste sans aucun détour sur certains détails dont la parfaite authenticité ne suffit sans doute pas, pour quelques lecteurs, à racheter leur caractère nauséabond. Bel-Ami ouvre donc la fenêtre.[25] "Toute la fraicheur parfumée[26] de la nuit entra, *troublant la flamme des deux bougies* allumées auprès du lit." Madeleine l'ayant rejoint près de la fenêtre, Bel-Ami lui fait avec toute sorte de ménagements une longue déclaration à laquelle il lui interdit de répondre immédiatement.

Le reste de l'épisode est rapidement enlevé, sur une note un peu différente. Il est de nouveau question du cadavre—en tant que cadavre—et, pour la dernière fois, des regrets de la veuve.[27] Celle-ci et Bel-Ami, "accoutumés déjà à l'idée de cette mort," regardent moins souvent du côté de Forestier. Après être restés quelque temps assis "d'une façon convenable, sans dormir," ils s'assoupissent tous deux vers minuit. Le lendemain matin ils s'étonnent que la barbe de Forestier ait poussé vigoureusement pendant la nuit.[28] Ils le mettent dans son cercueil; puis, "allégés, rassérénés . . . avec une envie éveillée de parler de choses consolantes, plus gaies, de rentrer dans la vie," ils s'asseyent pour déjeuner.

---

[23] "Une de ces affections . . . qui tiennent autant d'une séduction réciproque que d'une *sorte de complicité muette*."

[24] Cf. aussi p. 278 ("Midi sonna"), p. 267 ("le tic-tac dur d'une horloge de bois"), et notre note 13.

[25] De même, plus discrètement, dans *Madame Bovary* (p. 458): "Comme il étouffait un peu dans l'atmosphère trop lourde de la chambre, il ouvrit la fenêtre."

[26] Il y a au moins quatre allusions au parfum des fleurs dans ce chapitre.

[27] "Duroy ayant soupiré: Pauvre garçon! elle poussa à son tour un long *soupir* de résignation navrée."

[28] Comme si cela constituait "une menace surnaturelle de résurrection."

Après une nouvelle allusion au jardin et aux fleurs du printemps, l'auteur nous montre Madeleine expliquant à Bel-Ami l'idée assez révolutionnaire qu'elle se fait du mariage, ce qui, avec le départ de Bel-Ami pour Paris et le baiser qu'ils se jettent sur le quai, termine l'épisode.

Ce chapitre présente donc plusieurs ressemblances évidentes avec le texte de Flaubert, et comme celui-ci, il peut passer pour une *Matrone d'Éphèse* à la moderne, adaptée cette fois aux principes du pessimisme schopenhauerien. Voici dans quel ordre d'idées il faut en chercher, selon nous, la clé et l'unité : face à face avec la mort, et malgré l'enseignement de Norbert de Varenne, Bel-Ami se replonge aussitôt dans le monde du vouloir et du devenir, et se laisse prendre à ce piège tendu par la nature, la femme. Bel-Ami et Madeleine éprouvent tous deux, dirait-on, et quelque éphémère que soit ce sentiment, un certain regret pour Forestier. Mais les allusions à Vaudrec, ce "Je vais être bien seule" cité plus haut, et toute la seconde partie du roman font de Madeleine un être si énigmatique, si sinistre que, par comparaison avec elle, Bel-Ami n'est à cette époque qu'un enfant naïf. Si c'est bien là le sens de cet épisode—et nous n'en voyons pas de plus satisfaisant—on peut regretter que l'auteur ne se soit pas exprimé de façon plus directe et plus explicite. L'ironie qui s'accuse nettement vers la fin du morceau, n'aurait-il pas fallu la souligner un peu dans ce qui précède? Tel que l'auteur l'a laissé, ce tableau d'un amoureux transi à genoux devant son idole risque de se confondre, pour un lecteur non averti, avec du George Sand ou du Feuillet. Néanmoins, à tout prendre, et malgré une certaine mollesse aussi dans les parties abstraites et psychologiques, ce chapitre s'impose comme une image fidèle de mort, de deuil et de vie qui reprend. Du côté matériel et descriptif il présente une solidité indéniable, et cette antithèse constante entre l'haleine du printemps et des émanations de charnier, entre l'amour et la mort, est surtout d'une rare puissance.

La mort, la vieillesse et la maladie, d'une part, et la poussée des instincts de l'autre, voilà évidemment deux thèmes fondamentaux chez Maupassant, et qu'il a réunis dans d'autres récits également.[29] Mentionnons, pour le rapprocher aussi de la *Matrone d'Éphèse*, un conte intitulé *les Tombales* (1882). Si Pétrone nous montre une veuve qui, sortant du plus profond désespoir, en revient peu à peu, Bacchus et Cérès aidant, aux plaisirs de Vénus, Maupassant développe dans *les Tombales* cette idée que la perte récente d'un objet aimé et l'air qu'on respire dans les cimetières peuvent produire des effets aphrodisiaques. Avec son évocation du temps automnal, ses commentaires sur la question des cimetières et des épitaphes, son étude de la pseudo-veuve rôdant

[29] Cf. le rôle du cadavre dans *Un Réveillon*, par exemple (*Mademoiselle Fifi*, 1882), ou dans *la Roche aux guillemots* (*Contes du jour et de la nuit*, 1885).

autour des tombeaux en quête de veufs impressionnables, ce conte désabusé et railleur nous paraît recéler un élément de profonde vérité.

L'amour et la mort, dont l'association garde chez Flaubert un caractère plutôt métaphysique, se trouvent donc dans *les Tombales* réunis sur le plan physiologique et presque dans un rapport de causalité. C'est une conception plus accessible, dont le pathétique en quelque sorte plus quotidien semble se rapprocher davantage de Pétrone. Peut-être faut-il attribuer la même orientation au récit de Tourguéneff mentionné plus haut—puisque rien ne nous oblige à y voir une survivance du satanisme romantique[30]—et des idées analogues se retrouvent certainement chez Zola et chez Daudet.

Zola, qui n'a pas, à notre connaissance, écrit de *Matrone d'Éphèse* proprement dite, avait commencé par exploiter, dans *Thérèse Raquin* (1867), un thème qui en serait plutôt l'inverse (bien qu'on y perçoive comme un écho lointain de la version chinoise) : une femme et son amant *séparés* par le cadavre du mari.[31] Il formule une fois, dans *la Faute de l'abbé Mouret*, cette idée flaubertienne et biblique que l'amour renferme un principe de mort. Cependant, ce qui le caractérise généralement, c'est une acceptation mystique de la procréation et de la mort, qui finissent par se confondre à tel point dans son esprit, qu'il lui arrive de s'enthousiasmer indifféremment pour l'une et pour l'autre. Cette philosophie défraie notamment les derniers paragraphes de plusieurs de ses romans,[32] et elle était déjà implicite dans *la Fortune des Rougon*, où il faut retenir plus spécialement les amours de Silvère et de Miette, fleurissant et s'épanouissant, parmi toutes les violences d'une guerre civile, dans ce cimetière désaffecté décrit au commencement de l'ouvrage.

Daudet a laissé deux versions de la *Matrone d'Éphèse*, la première—imitation assez servile, comme nous le verrons tout à l'heure—dans *l'Immortel* (1888) ; l'autre, plus intéressante, et de même famille que *les Tombales*, dans *la Petite Paroisse* (1893).

On a affaire, dans *la Petite Paroisse*, à une "étude" de la jalousie et du pardon corsée d'une attaque contre la jeune génération en la personne de Charley, séducteur égoïste porté à l'auto-analyse comme Valmont, son prototype. Dans une lettre à son ami Vallongue, Charley raconte qu'il s'est enfui avec une certaine Mme Fénigan. A Monte-

[30] Dans des textes de Schwob et de Barrès sur la prostitution dans les cimetières (Mario Praz, pp. 356-357 et 364), il s'agit soit d'une sorte de satanisme, soit d'une opposition *in abstracto* entre l'amour et la mort.

[31] On sait que *Madeleine Férat* présente un thème plus ou moins analogue.

[32] *Germinal*, *La Terre* ("des morts, des semences, et le pain poussant de la terre"), *La Bête humaine* ("qu'importaient les victimes! . . . n'allait-elle pas quand même à l'avenir?"), *La Débâcle*, etc.

Carlo on a fait la connaissance d'un Suédois (ou Danois[33]), Nansen, et de sa femme Nina, qui est une Italienne, "attelage Nord et Midi d'un amusant contraste."[34] Voilà ensuite Nansen qui meurt subitement, après une violente attaque de mal de mer au cours de laquelle Nina—qualifiée plus loin de "veuve désespérée"—s'est montrée pleine de sollicitude. Trois jours plus tard, Charley se rend chez Nina. Il est question du désordre qui règne dans la villa des Nansen et de certaine "odeur de mixture et de sciure de bois," mais Charley insiste principalement sur son propre état juste avant de voir Nina:

> Était-ce le sirocco, l'haleine des lauriers-roses? Je me sentais la bouche sèche, les mains brûlantes, et tout mon être engourdi d'un vertige sensuel qui ne m'empêchait pas de songer à la mort

De plus, ajoute-t-il, il *savait* qu'il allait se passer quelque chose. En effet, lorsque Nina descend enfin, la voilà qui se jette, sans crier gare, dans les bras de Charley.

Certes, ce dénouement est alertement débité et, à un autre point de vue, on peut trouver que les données de l'épisode entier, la chaleur qu'il fait, le "vertige sensuel" de Charley, l'état déséquilibré de Nina déterminé par la fatigue et la dépression, constituent un document d'un certain intérêt sur le mécanisme de nos actes. Mais lorsque Charley prétend apprécier scientifiquement ce "cas passionnel," qui serait selon lui "mystérieux et presque indisable"—épithètes assez étonnantes dans la bouche de ce personnage cynique—quel flux de paroles peu cohérentes!

> Par quelle détente *diabolique*, dit Charley [ou plus exactement Daudet, puisque c'est le *nil admirari* au contraire qui serait dans le caractère de Charley], cette femme s'est-elle arrachée de ce mort qu'elle aimait, qu'elle pleurait, pour tomber inconsciente dans mes bras? Serait-ce qu'un souffle aphrodisiaque voltige autour des cercueils? ou simplement [*sic*] la vie reprend-elle sa revanche, dans une poussée véhémente et immédiate? J'ai la conviction que les médecins en savent plus qu'ils ne disent de ces instants de désordre et de *perversion*, dont *ils doivent souvent profiter*. Moi-même, une autre fois déjà, en des circonstances *encore plus terribles*, j'avais subi la *mystérieuse* influence ... l'amour et la mort, Vallongue![35]

Comme on le voit, il est proposé ici, pour expliquer l'action de Nina, au moins trois causes différentes: l'abattement physique et moral, des impressions olfactives, la "volonté de l'espèce," et pour conclure, le

[33] Nouv. Bibl. Flammarion (1924), p. 87 ("Suédois"), p. 88 ("mon Danois"), p. 92 ("ce Suédois").

[34] Page 87—"Cette petite Nina m'amorçait, dit-il (p. 88), par son double attrait mystérieux de femme et d'étrangère; *en plus, très éprise de son mari, excitante.*" A rapprocher de Molière, *Don Juan*, I, ii. De même provenance aussi, vraisemblablement, l'orage et la question du mal de mer dans un contexte pareil (cf. par exemple le *Don Juan* de Byron).

[35] Page 94. C'est nous qui soulignons.

phénomène en question est qualifié encore une fois de *mystérieux*. Le lecteur y perd son latin. "L'amour et la mort!" s'écrie Charley. Mais on ne sait ni ne saura jamais à quoi il est fait allusion dans la dernière phrase du passage. Nous sommes fort tenté d'expliquer cette lacune et ce style d'oracle en disant que la formule "l'amour et la mort" n'est ici qu'un simple mot à effet, ne correspondant à rien de précis dans la pensée de l'auteur. Du moins, malgré *l'Arlésienne* et certains détails des *Amoureuses*,[36] rien dans l'œuvre de Daudet n'accuse la moindre hantise de ce problème qui était tout de même capital chez Flaubert et Maupassant. D'une manière générale, du reste, ce n'est pas par les idées abstraites ou la logique que Daudet se signale le plus. Lorsqu'on songe au large éclecticisme dont il fait preuve en dénigrant à tour de rôle dans ses romans le Second Empire et la Troisième République, Zola et l'Académie, le matérialisme et le tolstoïsme, il est même difficile de le prendre au sérieux dans son rôle de "penseur."

En tant que romancier, bien qu'il reste, à côté de Flaubert ou de Zola, un simple amateur qui improvise, Daudet accuse un talent indiscutable pour l'anecdote rapide et le croquis pris sur le vif. Ces quelques pages de *la Petite Paroisse* nous paraissent en offrir un bon exemple. Nous sommes disposé—et sans éprouver le besoin de nous en scandaliser—à admettre comme une chose vraisemblable et vraie l'état d'hyperesthésie en question, correspondant à la fatigue et au contact de la maladie et de la mort. Rappelons à ce point de vue, et en nous adressant toujours aux romanciers, certain chapitre de *la Belle Saison* où, après une nuit de tension extrême passée à sauver la vie d'un enfant (qui même un instant cesse de respirer), Antoine Thibault et Rachel Goepfert s'étreignent dans une brusque flambée des sens,[37] ou encore la donnée d'un récit d'Hamsun, *Livets Røst*: une femme soigne pendant des mois et avec dévouement son mari plus âgé qu'elle, et puis, aussitôt devenue veuve, elle descend chercher un homme, le premier venu, dans la rue.[38]

Avec Hamsun, qui ménage à son amant le spectacle imprévu du

[36] *Les Amoureuses* (Paris, Bibl. Charpentier, 1895), p. 77: *La dernière amoureuse* (c'est-à-dire la mort); p. 307: *Les Rossignols du cimetière* (deux amoureux qui fréquentent le cimetière "par un raffinement d'amour"). Certaines réflexions de Daudet sur l'amour et la mort (à propos de *l'Arlésienne*) sont citées aussi par son fils Léon, notamment cette opinion que ce sont les hommes du Nord, et non ceux du Midi, qui croient à l'existence d'un rapport entre l'amour et la mort. Bien entendu, ce n'est pas de cette remarque de Daudet que nous nous autorisons pour affirmer que le problème en question ne lui tient pas fort au cœur.

[37] R. Martin du Gard, *Les Thibault*, 3e partie, I, ch. III. "Des nuits comme ça énervent," dit Rachel à la fin du chapitre.—Par plusieurs de ses éléments matériels, cet épisode rappelle d'ailleurs nettement *Une Page d'amour* (début et pp. 160-168, éd. Fr. Bernouard), bien qu'il entre surtout de la reconnaissance dans l'amour d'Hélène Mouret pour le docteur Deberle.

[38] Ce récit a paru *en volume* en 1903.

cadavre reposant dans une pièce voisine,[39] nous voilà de nouveau, surtout au point de vue de la mise en scène, en pleine *Matrone d'Éphèse*. Aussi a-t-on l'impression devant *Livets Røst*, et cette impression sera plus nette encore dans le cas des trois versions françaises dont nous allons nous occuper maintenant, que les accessoires du drame pétronien —le cadavre, le cercueil, le tombeau—ne sont pas toujours assez reculés à l'arrière-plan.

La plus *sincère* des trois versions en question, c'est sans doute *Après la bataille* (1880) de Paul Alexis.[40] Ce récit a sa source, pour une part, dans un certain fonds d'idées subversives, un non-conformisme tapageur et narquois caractéristique des auteurs de Médan. Cependant, il s'agit bien moins, dans *Après la bataille*, d'un document social que d'une étude de psychologie individuelle. L'auteur s'attache à démontrer par A + B comment une jeune Bretonne de famille noble, après nous être apparue d'abord dans un rôle d'héroïne antique emportant du champ de bataille la dépouille mortelle de son mari,[41] finit par devenir la maîtresse d'un simple soldat.

Rappelons le début assez original de cette nouvelle: un jeune soldat breton, blessé au talon, se traînant le long d'une route déserte, au crépuscule.[42] Ensuite, c'est la survenue de la veuve, conduisant un grand chariot; puis, après un regard en arrière sur le passé plutôt scabreux de chacun des deux personnages,[43] leur voyage à travers une carte de Tendre revue, dirait-on, par Zola. Le tout est ponctué, bien entendu, d'allusions au cercueil logé dans le fond du chariot.

Mais ces allusions paraissent d'autant moins nécessaires que l'idée du devoir joue un rôle à peu près nul dans l'évolution parcourue par l'héroïne. Or, pour l'auteur sans doute, comme pour nous, l'élément le plus intéressant de ce sujet est bien l'apostasie de la veuve, et Alexis s'efforce avant tout d'établir un système de causes, d'un ordre à la fois moral et matériel, susceptibles d'y aboutir. Ainsi l'héroïne, fâchée d'abord, se montre successivement émue, fière, curieuse, bonne; et on

[39] Adaptation assez transparente des données traditionnelles.

[40] Dans les *Soirées de Médan*. Nous citons l'éd. de 1892, Paris, Bibl. Charpentier.

[41] Telle Panthée, femme d'Abradate, chez Xénophon.

[42] Cf. le premier chapitre de *Germinal* (1885).

[43] L'adolescence du héros, qui a été prêtre avant de devenir soldat, fait songer à *la Faute de l'abbé Mouret* 1875). L'héroïne est un personnage de roman libertin. Pour cette "sœur du rêve" qu'elle s'était créée (p. 274) et d'autres détails—p. 270: "L'Océan non loin de là martelant la falaise... le vent s'engouffrant dans les vieilles croisées disjointes..."; p. 272: "La nuit surtout... le vent avait beau mugir..."; p. 275: "Ouvrant les bras dans le vide à un être inconnu..."— Alexis emprunte à Chateaubriand. Un autre paragraphe (p. 272: "Dans un vieux *Robinson Crusoë*, dont il manquait des pages, l'empreinte du pied de 'Vendredi' l'avait fait palpiter...") est calqué sur *Madame Bovary* (pp. 48-53).

distingue vers la fin, parmi les principaux facteurs entrant en ligne de compte, l'attouchement, l'inquiétude devant l'avenir, la fatigue, le froid. En tant qu'étude psychologique, *Après la bataille* a des prétentions à la complexité et fait penser en principe plutôt à Flaubert qu'à Zola. Mais certaines articulations sont nettement faibles. Ce qu'il y a là de plus étonnant au fond, c'est que l'auteur ait choisi, pour cette démonstration de la prépondérance des mouvements instinctifs, deux personnages à l'érotisme déjà bien caractérisé. On sait la préférence d'Alexis pour cette sorte de personnages,[44] qui répondent assez à son propre caractère. Peut-être, à la réflexion, serait-ce encore la meilleure interprétation de cette nouvelle que d'y voir une rêverie érotique d'un genre spécial (le jeune homme qui se trouve à la merci d'une dame de haut parage, sévère et à la fois voluptueuse), assaisonnée d'éléments macabres pris dans la *Matrone d'Éphèse*. Avec certaines qualités descriptives et de rares traits d'ironie, écrit d'un style exact où prédomine la phrase autonome (moins variée toutefois et moins poétique que celle de Flaubert) et où, comme chez Zola, des tours populaires viennent ajouter une note pittoresque, bien qu'on relève d'autre part certaines notations par trop insignifiantes, ou trop platement rendues, *Après la bataille* nous apparaît comme un curieux mélange d'observation et de subjectivité, dont l'inspiration essentiellement naïve a été, à tout prendre, mal servie par l'esthétique naturaliste.[45]

Si gauche que soit la version d'Alexis, nous la trouvons supérieure, sous plusieurs rapports, à celle tout en simili qui figure dans *l'Immortel* (1888). Dans son ensemble, ce roman est en principe une satire de l'Académie. Mais Daudet y mène de front deux ou trois actions assez distinctes: la carrière de l'académicien Astier-Réhu et ses recherches historiques basées sur des manuscrits faux, les efforts de Freydet pour entrer à l'Académie, l'arrivisme cynique du jeune Paul Astier, qui cherche à se marier avec quelque femme riche. Il en résulte un plan très épisodique dont l'auteur profite à plusieurs reprises pour juxtaposer deux incidents ou deux scènes qu'il a l'air de considérer comme parallèles. Ainsi, le manquement de Colette de Rosen au souvenir de son mari, lorsqu'elle se donne à Paul, se trouve juxtaposé avec la joie d'Astier-Réhu en apprenant la mort du secrétaire perpétuel Loisillon,

[44] Cf. son roman *Madame Meuriot* (1891).

[45] Relevons, par exemple, ce procédé technique qui consiste à noter seulement les détails dont se serait aperçu, à un moment donné, un spectateur hypothétique, procédé caractéristique de Flaubert et des Goncourt mais qu'Alexis emploie bien gauchement; ces deux biographies rétrospectives (comme dans *Germinie Lacerteux* ou *la Fille Élisa*), trop symétriques et ayant toutes deux comme prétexte ce fait que le personnage se met lui-même à réfléchir à sa vie passée; mais surtout ce point de vue rigoureusement déterministe qui, au fond, n'ajoute guère à l'intérêt des choses en question.

dont il prendra la succession (ch. VI) ; la colère de Paul, au moment où le prince d'Athis vient de lui souffler Colette, coïncide avec celle qu'éprouve Astier-Réhu en découvrant qu'on lui a volé certains manuscrits (ch. IX), et l'auteur met sur le même plan le mariage de Paul avec la duchesse de Padovani, cette veuve qui, par surcroît, vient d'être lâchée par son amant d'Athis, et ce fait que l'Académie a pris pour des documents authentiques des paperasses sans aucune valeur (ch. XV). Il est évident que ces juxtapositions sont non seulement artificielles mais dépourvues de sens. Cependant on ne saurait mettre en doute leur caractère intentionnel et leur importance aux yeux de Daudet lui-même. Nous serions même disposé à croire personnellement que tout ce qui, dans *l'Immortel*, remonte à Pétrone, c'est-à-dire toute l'histoire de cette Colette de Rosen qui, après avoir voulu *immortaliser* son mari défunt, se remarie comme la première venue—épisode qui parait d'abord et qui doit être considéré effectivement, selon nous, comme une superfétation—n'en a pas moins été envisagé par Daudet comme une sorte de commentaire symbolique propre à mettre en valeur ce thème principal: une compagnie de soi-disant immortels dont une série d'*enterrements* constitue la vie même. Mais quelles viandes creuses que tout cela pour un lecteur, et quelle façon saugrenue, au fond, de bâtir un roman!

Le veuvage de Colette et la cour que lui fait Paul Astier prennent beaucoup d'espace dans ce roman. Depuis deux ans, en tant qu'architecte, Paul travaille au mausolée du prince Herbert de Rosen, et on attend toujours une statue du prince dont s'est chargé le sculpteur Védrine. Il est né entre Colette et le jeune homme une amitié si étroite que celui-ci ne voit guère d'autre obstacle à leur mariage que le souvenir du prince défunt. Cependant, en réalité, Mme Astier en personne a été en train de combiner dans le plus grand secret un mariage entre Colette et le prince d'Athis.

Au chapitre II, l'auteur évoque rétrospectivement le veuvage de Colette. Évitant presque entièrement les notations morales, Daudet énumère toutes les manifestations extérieures de la douleur, traditionnelles pour la plupart dans un contexte pareil:[46]

> Les chroniques du temps ont raconté le désespoir à grand fracas de ce jeune veuvage, les cheveux blonds coupés ras, jetés dans la bière, la chambre transformée en chapelle ardente, les repas solitaires, à deux couverts, et sur la table de l'anti-

[46] En dehors d'Artémise, veuve de Mausole, et de la matrone d'Éphèse elle-même, rappelons ici les extravagances de la comtesse d'Harcourt, devenue veuve en 1769 (Mirabeau, *Lettres*, Paris, 1926, p. 346), et surtout celles de la princesse Belgiojoso en 1848, au moment où mourut son amant Stelzi (voir Mario Praz, pp. 121-122 et 172).

chambre, à leur place ordinaire, la canne, les gants, le chapeau du prince, comme s'il était là, comme s'il allait sortir.

Elle avait de plus tenu un journal où elle s'entretenait avec son mari décédé, et elle avait constamment renouvelé les fleurs sur sa tombe. Maintenant, au début de l'action, elle serait plus calme, mais elle trouve difficile, à cause du qu'en dira-t-on, de se départir ouvertement de ce culte rendu à la mémoire de son mari. Un jour, ayant invité Paul à déjeuner, elle fait servir, comme par caprice, dans la serre, pour ne pas avoir à manger devant le couvert de l'autre. Au chapitre VI, qui nous intéresse plus particulièrement, les visites au cimetière ont repris de plus belle. C'est que Colette, décidée désormais à épouser d'Athis, trouve "convenable, avant de prendre un nouveau mari, d'enterrer le premier définitivement, d'en finir avec ce mausolée et l'intimité dangereuse du trop séduisant architecte." Un jour, elle vient prendre Paul chez lui et, après avoir refusé, au grand chagrin du jeune homme, de pénétrer dans l'appartement, elle part avec lui en voiture pour le cimetière:

(1) En cours de route, ils parlent entre autres choses de la figure—un nu couché sur le dos—à laquelle Védrine est en train de travailler. Colette est d'avis, et Paul finit par en convenir aussi, que l'effet serait meilleur si, au lieu d'y placer cette figure, on laissait complètement vide le dessus du sarcophage, sculpté en forme de lit. Descendus au Père-Lachaise, ils se dirigent vers le mausolée du prince, en se tenant par le bras et suivis du valet qui porte des fleurs. L'auteur mentionne successivement la chaleur du jour, la pluie qui vient de tomber, des cris d'oiseaux, des bruits d'instruments. Paul, qui s'en prend au mari, comme d'habitude, est toujours de mauvaise humeur, bien que Colette y mette du sien en renvoyant le laquais. Elle au contraire, que ce soit le lieu, la chaleur ou l'odeur des fleurs et de la terre mouillée, se sent "singulièrement heureuse."[47]

(2) Tout à coup, Paul lui prend la main. "Il la serrait, l'étreignait comme un corps de femme, cette petite main qui n'avait pas le courage de s'en aller." Elle se dit: "Non, non . . . jamais!" Mais ils avancent toujours, "très émus, car tout est relatif dans la volupté et c'est la résistance qui fait le désir," et la main de Colette finit par s'ouvrir, par se donner:

[47] "Elle, au contraire, se sentait singulièrement heureuse, épanouie dans cet égoïsme de santé et de vie qui nous prend aux endroits de mort. Peut-être la chaleur du jour, ces fleurs embaumées, mêlant leur arome à celui plus fort des ifs et des buis, de la terre mouillée s'évaporant au soleil et aussi à une autre odeur, âcre, fade, pénétrante, qu'elle connaissait bien, mais qui, ce jour-là, ne l'écœurait pas comme ordinairement, la grisait plutôt."

Mais, tout de suite, l'orgueil de la femme se réveilla. Elle voulut parler, prouver qu'elle restait intacte, que cela se passait loin d'elle, même qu'elle l'ignorait parfaitement, et ne trouvant rien à dire, elle lisait tout haut l'épitaphe d'une tombe à plat dans les ronces.

C'est à ce moment précis que Daudet s'avise de parler du cimetière. Sa description du Père-Lachaise, moins concrète et moins suggestive que celle de Flaubert, paraît en même temps inférieure à celle de Balzac comme émotion et largeur.[48] Cette digression se termine par une nouvelle allusion aux épitaphes et à Colette qui, "toujours pour feindre d'ignorer l'étreinte de leurs deux mains," continue à les lire. Ensuite, ayant entendu le grincement d'une porte de caveau, ils s'aperçoivent qu'une femme est en train de les regarder :

Gênées, leurs mains se décroisèrent ; et, subitement allégée du mauvais charme, la princesse passa devant, un peu confuse, prit au plus court à travers les tombes, pour joindre plus vite le mausolée du prince.

(3) Après une description méthodique du tombeau (figurant une tente avec, à l'intérieur, le sarcophage en lit-de-camp, et tout autour, une grille "dans le sentiment de la grille du tombeau des Scaliger, à Vérone"), l'auteur nous montre Colette qui y pénètre et qui se met à prier, mais sans ferveur. Elle regarde le sarcophage, "cette dure couche sans rien dessus," et le trouve d'un bel effet :

Pourtant, il fallait consulter M. Paul dont on entendait les pas d'attente sur le gravier du jardinet, et tout en approuvant sa discrétion, elle allait l'appeler quand le caveau s'assombrit. La pluie se remit à tinter sur les trèfles vitrés de la coupole.

Paul refuse d'entrer d'abord. "Je ne veux pas, dit-il, vous l'aimez trop." Mais Colette insiste et l'attire par la main sur l'entrée du caveau. Ici se place le passage le plus frappant de cet épisode et qui mériterait d'être cité intégralement : Paul et Colette forcés par la pluie à se replier sur le sarcophage contre lequel ils restent adossés, à regarder devant eux ; l'apparence du cimetière, où seuls se font entendre l'eau qui coule et la voix de deux ouvriers ; le parfum des fleurs, avec les autres odeurs

[48] "Ils arrivaient dans la vingtième division, cette partie du cimetière qui est comme le vieux Paris du Père-Lachaise, les allées plus étroites, les arbres plus hauts, les tombes plus serrées, un enchevêtrement de grilles, de colonnes de temples grecs, de pyramides, d'anges, de génies, de bustes, d'ailes ouvertes ou repliées..." Dans ce qui suit, l'auteur développe en termes assez abstraits, trois idées banales : (a) les tombes accusent du bon ou du mauvais goût, "comme les existences qu'elles recouvraient" [*sic*] ; (b) certaines d'entre elles ont été entretenues avec soin, d'autres pas ; (c) mais ce sont exclusivement des tombes de notabilités parisiennes, ainsi que les épitaphes en font foi.—Balzac décrit le Père-Lachaise dans *Ferragus* (Calmann-Lévy, VIII, 1869, p. 111) ; Flaubert dans l'*Éducation sentimentale*, p. 548 ("Les tombes se levaient au milieu des arbres...").

dont il a été question plus haut ; la langueur de Colette ; leur immobilité à tous deux si complète qu'un petit oiseau—un rossignol—vient en sautillant dans le caveau ; Colette qui, sur le point de demander : "Est-ce qu'ils chantent encore en ce mois-ci?" se trouve tout à coup dans les bras de Paul, qu'elle embrasse de son côté. "Parce que l'amour, conclut l'auteur, est plus fort que la mort." Exception faite de cette dernière remarque, dont nous reparlerons, il nous semble que, par la richesse de ses détails (la voix des ouvriers, le rossignol, la question que Colette *se propose* de faire, etc.), ses transitions heureuses, sa traduction expressive des impressions sensorielles, c'est là un morceau irréprochable de forme et de fond.

Il ne faut pas méconnaître la puissance descriptive de cette conclusion, comme de l'épisode entier, surtout en ce qui concerne la notation des bruits et des odeurs. Le style de Daudet comporte évidemment certaines répétitions qui ne sont pas absolument nécessaires ;[49] l'emploi qu'il fait, comme les Goncourt, de séries de termes plus ou moins synonymes tend à produire un effet d'imprécision, et son ton mièvre,[50] surtout en parlant des femmes, est parfois agaçant. Au point de vue de la psychologie, si l'on se résigne à accepter ce fait que Paul ignore tout du projet de mariage avec d'Athis, et si, en lisant un peu entre les lignes, on attribue ce tête-à-tête que Colette a cherché, non pas à son désir d'*en finir* avec Paul, mais tout bonnement au goût instinctif qu'elle a pour lui, rien ne s'écarte ici de la plus stricte vraisemblance. Cette impression de Colette qui tour à tour se donne et se reprend, cette "résistance qui fait le désir," saisie surtout dans ses manifestations extérieures et présentée avec une désinvolture de romancier impressionniste—d'autant plus légitime ici, dirait-on, que l'auteur semble refuser de prendre son héroïne trop au sérieux—tout cela nous paraît acceptable.[51] Mais, si cette note de misogynie bonne enfant est bien celle que l'auteur a voulue, pourquoi y renonce-t-il dans les derniers paragraphes? Impossible de ne pas voir combien cette conclusion et ce "Parce que l'amour est plus fort que la mort" sont graves, voire profonds, dans l'intention de l'auteur. *L'amour et la mort!* Cependant, au bout du compte, le lecteur n'a rien de plus solennel sous les yeux que le spectacle de deux amoureux s'embrassant *dans un cimetière*, et, de quelque façon qu'on interprète ce verset du Cantique des cantiques, il aurait fallu, pour pouvoir l'appliquer sérieusement ici, entrer beaucoup plus avant dans cette âme de veuve que Daudet n'a songé à le faire.

---

[49] "Une autre odeur" (*bis*) ; "grincement d'outils," "cris d'oiseaux" (*ter*).

[50] "La pauvre petite femme"; "cette attention gentille"; "cette petite main" (*ter*). Il arrive parfois à Maupassant aussi de prendre ce ton.

[51] On pourrait critiquer, tout au plus, un ou deux détails trop peu explicites : "L'orgueil de la femme se réveilla"; "Il fallait consulter M. Paul . . . et *tout en approuvant sa discrétion*, elle allait l'appeler . . ."

Ici, à bon droit, nous nous souviendrons de Pétrone, que le charme de ces derniers paragraphes nous faisait oublier. De toutes les veuves dont il a été question jusqu'ici, seule Colette présente cette ressemblance avec la matrone d'Éphèse qu'elle se livre à son amant *dans le tombeau même du mari.* Si génial que Daudet paraisse par certains côtés, on ne saurait passer sous silence la question de ses nombreux emprunts littéraires. Rien que dans *l'Immortel*, Daudet est redevable à *l'Avare* pour certains traits de son Astier-Réhu, à Balzac et à Virgile pour sa duchesse de Padovani abandonnée par d'Athis, à un thème populaire de la littérature antiféministe pour Fage, son bossu à femmes. En ce qui concerne la *Matrone d'Éphèse*, non seulement Daudet reproduit les démonstrations de la veuve (chez Pétrone, elle s'arrache les cheveux et veut s'enfermer à jamais) et sa chute qui a lieu dans le tombeau même, mais le rôle de Mme Astier correspond à celui de la servante dans Pétrone, le déjeuner en tête-à-tête signalé plus haut doit remonter également au texte latin, et même l'idée d'exclure du mausolée la statue du prince Herbert est la transposition, vraisemblablement, de cette crucifixion du mari qui termine le récit pétronien. Ces faits n'ont pas tous la même importance et, malgré leur nombre, ils ne nous autoriseraient sans doute pas à nous désintéresser entièrement du roman de Daudet. Mais une *invention* ainsi conçue, jointe à la méthode de composer que nous avons vue, amène fatalement un lecteur tant soit peu critique à se méfier de Daudet, à mettre en doute du même coup la valeur de son témoignage et sa vocation pour le roman. Malgré ses dons d'anecdotier et de peintre, c'est un romancier, au fond, qui ne sait pas où il va. Aussi dirons-nous de la conclusion de cet épisode—et bien que le tombeau vienne en droite ligne de Pétrone, la pluie de Virgile,[52] et le rossignol, qui sait? de *Roméo et Juliette*—que c'est un véritable joyau du style descriptif, mais un joyau dont la monture est plutôt en camelote.

Rappelons enfin pour mémoire un récit comique d'Hugues Le Roux intitulé *la Sentinelle* (1889)[53] et où l'on retrouve, à peine modifiés, les principaux éléments de la *Matrone d'Éphèse* de Pétrone (la veuve éplorée, le soldat, l'idylle à l'intérieur du tombeau, etc.). Ce récit, que l'auteur aurait recueilli en Bretagne, pourrait avoir une certaine importance pour le folklore, mais il présente trop peu d'intérêt au point de vue littéraire pour qu'il soit utile d'en parler longuement ici.

Si incomplets que soient ces aperçus sur le roman des années 80, il devrait être possible d'en tirer certaines conclusions d'un ordre général.

[52] *Énéide*, IV. Dans deux autres cas au moins, chez Daudet, un orage sert à amener une scène d'amour ; voir *Numa Roumestan*, ch. XIII, et *la Petite Paroisse*, pp. 106-107.

[53] *Entre hommes* (2e éd. Paris, 1889), pp. 215-225.

Qu'un thème littéraire se soit si souvent reproduit, il n'y a rien là d'anormal, en principe, pour qui ne croit pas au caractère *révélé* de la littérature. Cependant, à envisager d'une certaine façon le cas présent, un lecteur pourrait n'en retenir que ce fait susceptible de l'étonner: de cette demi-douzaine de veuves, pas une seule ne devient folle, ne se suicide, ni même, comme la princesse de Clèves, ne se retire du monde, ce qui implique, absolument parlant, une assez triste conception de la femme. Nous n'oublions pas que Mme Dambreuse et Mme Forestier prennent toutes deux un amant du vivant de leur mari, et que l'héroïne d'*Après la bataille* est de tout temps une nature corrompue. Ce sont là au contraire des faits qui concourent à l'effet général, à cette impression pessimiste qu'il faut bien mentionner ici, puisqu'on s'en autorise volontiers depuis quelque temps pour crier haro sur les naturalistes.

Ces vieux volumes jaunes ou bleus respirent incontestablement une certaine mélancolie. Mais est-il vraiment permis à un lettré de s'y arrêter? Si, par un retour inévitable, différentes formes d'idéalisme se sont substituées, du moins provisoirement, au matérialisme désabusé qui caractérise l'époque de Flaubert, faut-il en conclure à la nullité *artistique* du roman naturaliste? Entre la critique d'hier avec ses certitudes et celle qui affiche aujourd'hui un scepticisme tel qu'elle est prête à nier l'existence des valeurs "proprement littéraires,"[54] se concevant comme une sorte de divination mystique, qui serait même en principe l'apanage du "créateur," du *vates sacer*, n'y a-t-il pas lieu de chercher un moyen terme, et de reconnaître que le genre romanesque est historiquement l'un des arts plastiques, s'occupant en premier lieu, non pas des concepts, mais des phénomènes, que le don de créer et le talent littéraire existent à l'état indépendant et se manifestent indifféremment chez le pessimiste ou chez l'optimiste, le négateur ou l'illuminé, et qu'enfin, s'il est vrai qu'un romancier peut être en même temps philosophe, on ne saurait considérer comme *indispensable* qu'il le soit, ni surtout exiger que son "message" paraisse neuf et positif aux yeux des jeunes?[55] Autrement c'est le règne de l'arbitraire. *Hamlet* passera pour une "pièce manquée," *la Princesse de Clèves* apparaîtra, en tant qu'"é-

[54] Voir Cl.-Edm. Magny, *Les Sandales d'Empédocle* (1945), pp. 13, 36, 37, etc.

[55] Selon Madame Magny, qui reconnait cependant les "vraies beautés" du style de Flaubert, la conclusion de l'*Éducation sentimentale* serait une platitude: "Ce n'est pas une découverte bien sensationnelle. Au contraire, à la fin de *la Nausée*, il y a un 'message' véritable..." (p. 143). Même note chez Joë Bousquet (*Problèmes du roman*, Confluences 1943, p. 180) lorsqu'il constate que, depuis les naturalistes, "heureusement la philosophie a évolué." On trouvera *passim* dans *Problèmes du roman*, des théories sur le "roman pur" (nécessité d'éliminer du genre toutes ces inutilités qui l'encombrent: les descriptions, dialogues, incidents, etc.) et en même temps cette idée que le romancier doit d'abord "être un homme," porteur de quelque "message" positif, étant donné que le roman est une "école de vie."

cole de vie," le *nec plus ultra* de la littérature,[56] la pauvreté—baptisée sobriété ou simplicité—sera préférée à l'exubérance des grands créateurs, il suffira pour faire leur procès à Huysmans et à Maupassant de les déclarer "passés de mode" et, pour des raisons extra-littéraires, toute la dette du roman moderne à Flaubert et aux Goncourt sera méconnue ou niée.

Certains des textes que nous avons examinés présentent sans doute un intérêt assez faible. Le Roux, évidemment, ne compte guère. Après quelque hésitation, nous consentirons à tourner le dos à Alexis également, et même à Daudet, malgré l'art prestigieux de certains paragraphes. Mais rien ne nous autorise, semble-t-il, à renier Flaubert et Maupassant.

Dans toutes ces versions de la *Matrone d'Éphèse*, non seulement l'héroïne déroge, nécessairement, à sa gloire, mais, chose curieuse, aucun de nos auteurs ne songe à étudier sérieusement le chagrin, éphémère ou non, que doivent éprouver la plupart des femmes en perdant leur mari, élément pourtant essentiel chez Pétrone et qui en principe aurait été parfaitement à sa place dans tous ces textes, hormis celui de Flaubert. Tout en se moquant du chagrin violent des veuves, un Montaigne ou un Brantôme ne laissent pas de le caractériser sommairement,[57] et lorsqu'on songe à telle trouvaille faite par Balzac de ce côté-là[58] et qui s'impose d'emblée comme la vérité même, on peut regretter ici que cette sorte de pathétique soit à tel point absente. Daudet, qui est à peu près seul à s'occuper du désespoir de son héroïne, ne sort pas du banal et du superficiel. A ce point de vue, il était réservé

[56] Voir, par exemple, Albert Camus, "L'Intelligence et l'échafaud" (*Problèmes du roman*, pp. 218-223), étude intéressante mais qui repose tout entière sur la *supposition* que, dans le cas de *la Princesse de Clèves*, la sobriété, l'objectivité sont voulues alors que, si les naturalistes sont sobres et objectifs, c'est qu'ils n'ont rien à dire. Dès lors, pour Camus (p. 221), "cérémonie," "monotonie," "ton compassé" deviennent, chez Madame de La Fayette, *beautés* littéraires. Le point de vue de J. Fabre, dans son étude très approfondie de *la Princesse de Clèves* (Publ. de la fac. des lettres de... Strasbourg, Fasc. 105, Mélanges 1945, II, Études littéraires, Paris, 1946, pp. 261-306) n'est pas moins remarquable: *la Princesse de Clèves* n'accuserait *aucun* défaut littéraire. On n'échappe pas à l'impression qu'ici, comme chez Albert Camus, des considérations non-littéraires sont à l'origine de cette conviction que *chaque* détail du roman est esthétiquement voulu (cf. d'ailleurs l'emploi fréquent de ces termes affectifs: "dignité," "art hautain"; cela constitue même ici une sorte de pétition de principe). S'il en avait été autrement, ces critiques n'auraient pas hésité à reconnaître que l'auteur donne parfois dans des enthousiasmes de précieuse, et qu'il lui arrive de nous faire trop sentir ses efforts pour trouver le "fin du fin."

[57] Montaigne, *De trois bonnes femmes*; Brantôme, *De l'amour des veuves*.

[58] Voir, dans *le Message*, les réactions de Juliette, lorsqu'elle apprend la mort de son *amant*.—Dans *la Femme de trente ans*, ch. II, l'on voit Julie d'Aiglemont ("cette pauvre Artémise d'Éphèse," dit Balzac vers la fin du chapitre) qui, un peu comme dans nos textes, revient peu à peu du désespoir où l'avait plongée la mort de son amant.

à un autre romancier, Pirandello, d'écrire dans *l'Uscita del vedovo*[59] une *Matrone d'Éphèse* plus nuancée que celle de Pétrone et dont le mérite consiste justement dans ce fait que l'auteur, s'attachant avant tout à bien caractériser les regrets et les souffrances de son personnage principal, se contente d'amorcer seulement cette idée que le temps finira par avoir raison de tout cela.

Malgré le pli satirique des auteurs naturalistes, ce serait trop simplifier les choses que d'attribuer uniquement à la misogynie cette lacune présentée par nos textes—le récit de Petrone n'est plus, comme au moyen âge, un simple instrument de la propagande antiféministe—et il serait également hasardé de parler de froideur d'âme, étant donné que ces auteurs ont analysé ailleurs avec une sympathie remarquable toutes les réactions d'une femme *abandonnée par son amant*. Il conviendrait plutôt de se rappeler avec quelle ferme conviction Flaubert, Maupassant, Alexis—en cela peu différents de Balzac, au fond—croyaient voir dans le mariage l'une des "belles blagues" de la civilisation.

Mais la véritable clé de ces textes, ou du moins des deux principaux, c'est que la femme n'est plus au centre des choses. Nous avons affaire ici à l'homme, à l'humanité, et cette vieille histoire de la veuve qui convole est devenue, par la juxtaposition des deux hommes, l'un mort et l'autre vivant, le symbole de la destinée humaine envisagée comme une danse macabre. Il nous semble en effet que Flaubert et Maupassant ont voulu établir une sorte d'équivalence entre ce mort et ce vivant, et nous irions jusqu'à affirmer que, sous cette forme transposée, c'est bel et bien de la mort du héros, en un certain sens, qu'il est question dans ces deux épisodes—fait qu'on pourrait d'ailleurs interpréter indifféremment comme un raffinement de l'art narratif ou comme un cas où l'idée abstraite a pris le pas sur l'observation.

Chez Flaubert, certains aspects secondaires du bovarysme des personnages donnent lieu à des développements en harmonie avec le thème central, autour duquel ils viennent se grouper en un dessin extrêmement fouillé. Chez Maupassant, la traduction concrète de cette antithèse schopenhauerienne entre le vouloir vivre et le néant sert à souligner fortement la tendance générale du texte, tout en lui donnant de la cohésion.

---

[59] Dans *la Vita nuda* (1910) (Milan, 1919, pp. 27-47). On retrouve dans le récit qui donne son titre à ce volume, la veuve, la statue et l'architecte de *l'Immortel*, tandis que, dans *la Buon'anima* (pp. 183-195), il s'agit d'un homme qui, ayant épousé une veuve, est obsédé par l'idée de son prédécesseur (comme dans *le Vengeur*, *Bel-Ami* et Brantôme). En lisant ces textes de Pirandello, comme dans le cas de Sartre aussi, on se rend vite compte que ce sont l'observation, le sens du réel, et non pas l'à priori, qui y prennent la *première* place.

On peut affirmer en somme de chacun de ces deux textes, d'une part, qu'il prend une valeur générale en même temps qu'il résume en quelque sorte le roman entier, et de l'autre, que son intérêt littéraire provient dans une mesure très considérable de l'abondance et de la puissance suggestive des notations sensorielles, et de certaines qualités, purement techniques en principe, comme la symétrie et la répétition.

En ce qui concerne la série entière de ces *Matrone d'Éphèse*, constatons que seuls Le Roux et Daudet donnent dans cette invraisemblance qui consiste à faire du tombeau une chambre à coucher, tandis que la version chinoise, avec son mari ressuscité, n'a pas été imitée, que nous sachions, par les auteurs naturalistes.[60] Depuis cette époque, en adaptant au théâtre, et toujours d'après Pétrone, ce thème un peu leste, un Cocteau ou un Fry[61] n'ont eu garde de supprimer le tombeau, ficelle tout indiquée pour donner au spectacle, à peu de frais, une certaine pointe de scandale, et on a même vu des pièces de théâtre—plus ou moins sincères—où sont reproduites les données fantastiques de la version chinoise.[62]

Quant à la branche secondaire de ces textes, constituée par *les Tombales*, *la Petite Paroisse*, *Livets Røst*, et où il est question d'un certain effet aphrodisiaque produit par la mort d'un objet aimé (idée analogue à celle, attribuée à Pétrone lui-même par Fossataro,[63] selon laquelle "le désespoir de la veuve et sa promptitude à prendre un amant sont de même origine"), nous avons dit plus haut qu'il doit y avoir quelque chose de foncièrement vrai dans cette conception. Ajoutons ici que si ces textes-là ont quelque valeur littéraire, c'est en tant qu'études purement *imitatives* et où il ne s'agit tout au plus, en fait d'idées abstraites, que de l'ambivalence des émotions humaines—"message" qui, de toute façon, ne saurait passer pour très positif.

University of Leeds

---

[60] *En Famille*, avec son cas de catalepsie, présente un sujet voisin. On trouvera, bien entendu, chez Villiers de l'Isle-Adam (*Véra*), un mari qui parvient, rien que par la force de sa volonté, à ressusciter sa femme.

[61] Cocteau, *La Matrone d'Éphèse*, pièce représentée au cabaret de l'A. B. C. en 1936 (cf. *Nouv. litt.*, 28 mars 1936, p. 8) ; Christopher Fry, *A Phœnix too Frequent*, comédie représentée au Mercury Theatre en 1946.

[62] J. M. Synge, *The Shadow of the Glen* (1903) ; cf. aussi D. H. Greene, *"The Shadow of the Glen* and the *Widow of Ephesus," PMLA*, LXII (1947), 233-238; Donagh McDonagh, *Happy as Larry, A Melodrama in Ballad*, représenté en 1947 au Mercury Theatre et plus tard dans le West End.—Le roman de Charles Rey, *Un drôle de mort* (Paris, 1938) serait aussi à rapprocher de la version chinoise.

[63] Cité par Marmorale, p. 95, note 1.

RONSARD, DU BARTAS, AND THE HOMERIC COMPARISON

A. Emerson Creore

FROM THE very first the poets of the Pléiade gave an important place to figures of speech in their theories of imitation of the writers of antiquity. In all the theories of poetry from the *Deffense* of 1549 to the posthumous preface to the *Franciade* in 1587, the use of simile, metaphor, periphrasis, and other tropes is recommended and illustrated. It does not appear from the recorded views of Ronsard that he ever considered these figures as more than ornaments to be set (to use a well-known metaphor) like a stone in the mosaic of serious verse. Yet Ronsard, and after him Du Bartas, used the Homeric comparison in ways unknown to Homer, or in ways which were not characteristic of Homer.[1]

The characteristic feature of the Homeric simile, as used by Homer himself and by the ancient authors generally, is its discursiveness. A comparison is suggested by some aspect of the subject under discussion and the poet proceeds to develop this comparison independently, forgetting momentarily the detail which had suggested it. In *Odyssey*, XII, 251 we read:

> Even as when a fisher on some headland lets down with a long rod his baits for a snare to the little fishes below, casting into the deep the horn of an ox of the homestead, and as he catches each, flings it writhing ashore, so writhing were [the Greeks] borne upward to the cliff.[2]

It is clear that the image of the writhing Greeks suggested a comparison with the writhing fish, but the precise description of the fisherman is a development extraneous to the narration proper. There is only one point of similarity between the narration and the matter of the simile.

[1] The same could be said, not only of Homer, but also of the ancient writers generally with whom Ronsard was familiar.

[2] Butcher and Lang translation, *Complete Works of Homer* (New York, Modern Library, n.d.), p. 188.

Ronsard used a great many similes of this type in his Pindaric odes, the *Hymnes*, and the *Franciade*.[3] For an example we may take a description from the "Hymne de la Justice":

> La Justice . . .
> Avec toutes ses sœurs, quittant ce val mondain,
> Au ciel s'en retourna d'un vol prompt et soudain,
> Comme on voit quelques fois singler à-tire-d'ailles
> En un temps orageux cinq ou six colombelles,
> Qui de peur de la gresle au logis s'en revont
> Et vistes parmy l'air volent toutes d'un front.[4]

As in the Homeric simile quoted above, there is only one point in common between Ronsard's simile and the narration leading up to it. The simile was suggested by the idea of flight, but the details relating to the birds have no counterpart in the action of the allegorical figure of Justice. It is important to notice that this comparison is borrowed, as Paul Laumonier has pointed out, from either Homer or Virgil.[5] If Ronsard's similes of this discursive type are examined individually, it is discovered that most of them are direct borrowings from the ancient writers.

There is a second type of comparison, however, which was used in antiquity much less frequently than the one just described. In this type each detail of the simile has a specific counterpart in the narration. This is the type which Ronsard favors in his original (or apparently original) similes, or when he borrows from a contemporary source. As an example one may take a few lines from the "Hymne de Calaïse et Zethes":

> Zethes du premier coup n'a pas son aile esmuë,
> Ny son frere Calaïs, mais ainsi qu'une grue
> Avance une enjambée, ou deux ou troys, davant
> Qu'abandonner la terre, et se donner au vent,
> Ainsy deux ou troys pas en grand haste enjamberent
> Les enfans d'Aquilon, puis en l'air s'esleverent . . .[6]

Here there are four parallel elements. "Une grue" corresponds to "les enfans d'Aquilon," "avance une enjambée" to "en grand haste enjamberent," "deux ou troys" to "deux ou trois pas," and "se donner au vent" is matched by "en l'air s'esleverent." This comparison, too, is borrowed, but not from Homer or Virgil. It comes from Ariosto, and in the original

[3] For the purposes of the present study only the similes of Ronsard's production in the major genres has been studied in detail. However, no significant differences in the similes occurring in his lyric poetry have been observed in the course of a more cursory examination.

[4] Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Paul Laumonier, Société des Textes Français Modernes, VIII (1935), "Hymne de la Justice," lines 197-202.

[5] Laumonier edition, VIII, 57, note 4.

[6] Laumonier edition, VIII, "Hymne de Calaïs et Zethes," lines 369-74.

the parallelism is entirely lacking. The matching of detail with detail is original with Ronsard.[7]

A kind of subdivision of the "parallel" type of simile occurs in a number of comparisons in which there is a considerable amount of non-parallel material; these amount to a combination of the parallel and the discursive types. This kind of simile is sometimes found in Homer and the other writers of antiquity. One example of it occurs in the *Franciade* in the description of the defeat of Phovère by Francus:

> Phovère imprime en tombant de son long
> La poudre molle: Ainsi tombe le tronc
> Qu'un vent abat du haut de la montagne
> Qui tout à plat s'estend sur la campagne.[8]

Here there is a close parallelism between *Phovère—tronc, tombant—tombe, de son long—tout à plat,* and *la poudre molle—la campagne,* while the verse *Qu'un vent abat . . .* is pertinent to the comparison only, having no counterpart in the description of Phovère.

There is still another type of simile which is in effect a refinement of the parallel type. In this group the parallelism is present but not stated. The simile is apparently discursive, but actually continues the narration by implication. Phovère and Francus confront each other before they do battle:

> [Phovère] resembloit à ce flot dizenier,
> Boufi des vents, horreur du marinier,
> Qui d'un grand branle en menaçant se vire
> Impetueux sur le bord du navire:
> L'autre sembloit au bon pilote expert,
> Qui plus d'esprit que de force se sert,
> Ores la proüe ores la poupe il tourne,
> Et vigilant en un lieu ne sejourne,
> Ains adjoustant l'experience à l'art
> D'un œil prudent evite le hazard.[9]

Here the description of the wave and the ship with its pilot clearly describes also the maneuvers of the two contestants, and the simile has be-

---

[7] Cf. *Orlando furioso,* II, strophe 49:

> "Cominciò a poco a poco indi a levarse,
> come suol far la peregrina grue,
> che corre prima, e poi vediamo alzarse
> alla terra vicina un braccio o due;
> e quando tutte sono all'aria sparse,
> velocissime mostra l'ale sue:
> si ad alto il negromante batte l'ale
> ch'a tanta altezza appena aquila sale."

[8] *Œuvres de Pierre de Ronsard,* ed. Ch. Marty-Laveaux (Paris, 1877-93), III, 80. Other examples of the parallel type are found on pp. 15, 31, and 80. Still others from the *Hymnes* may be found in Vol. VIII of the Laumonier edition: "Hymne de la Foi," line 181; "Fortune," line 251; "Or," line 28; "Calaïs et Zethes," lines 187, 369, 405; "Pollux et Castor," lines 1, 29.

[9] Marty-Laveaux edition, III, 76.

come an integral part of the narration. This type of simile performs a double function: it adds color to the poem by its reference to things and ideas outside of the immediate subject of the narration, and at the same time it continues the narration through the constant application which the reader is able to make for himself of the elements of the comparison to the situation which it illustrates. Thus when one reads "Qui d'un grand branle en menaçant se vire," one can visualize not only the wave but also Phovère, who is logically as much the subject of the comparison as its grammatical subject "ce flot."[10]

It is clear that Ronsard's use of the simile was dictated not by an instinctively felt need for heightening the poetic effect of his narration, but by the principle of imitation and the conviction that the use of similes was required in epic technique. The deliberate nature of their use as ornamentation is nowhere more evident than in the *Franciade*, where a whole series is used in an obvious attempt at reproducing the ancient manner. But in other instances, where Ronsard introduces a comparison less awkardly than in the *Franciade*, it is apparent that he is using them to clarify and to explain as well as to ornament. This fact can hardly be missed in certain cases where he takes pains to explain the relation between the comparison and the thing compared. A good example of this occurs in the "Hymne de la Justice":

> Car sans elle [la Justice] le peuple effrénément vivroit,
> Comme un navire en mer, qui en poupe n'auroit
> Un pillote ruzé, pour ses voyes conduire:
> *Car cela de quoy sert un pillote au navire*
> La Loy sert aux Citez et au peuple qui est
> Inconstant en pensée et n'a jamais d'arrest.[11]

What has happened here is that Ronsard has used the image of a ship and its pilot to visualize and make tangible the abstract idea of justice. But not content with this visualization, he has gone on to explain his explanation, and has gone out of his way to make the parallelism apparent to even the least imaginative reader.

In general it may be said that Ronsard's comparisons, considered according to their structure, most resemble those of Homer when they are consciously imitated or when their subject matter is directly bor-

[10] This simile is borrowed from the *Argonautae* of Apollonius Rhodius, II, 70 ff.: "Hereupon the Bebrycian king—even as a fierce wave of the sea rises in a crest against a swift ship, but she by the skill of the crafty pilot just escapes the shock when the billow is eager to break over the bulwark—so he followed up the son of Tyndareus . . ." It is important to observe that Apollonius presents the scene as it would appear to an onlooker—the wave dashing against the ship and the ship maneuvering away. Ronsard, on the other hand, makes the identification of the pilot with Francus more explicit, and makes the distinction between the two parts of the simile more definite than it was in Apollonius.

[11] Laumonier edition, VIII, "Hymne de la Justice," lines 485-90.

rowed from Homer or other writers of antiquity. For the rest, Ronsard is concerned in using them to clarify and to explain at least as much as to ornament; and then the similes are un-Homeric in the sense that they correspond more directly and more frequently with the narration which they illustrate than the similes of Homer usually do.

All of the types of comparison noticed in Ronsard are to be found again in the *Muse Chrétienne* and the *Semaines* of Du Bartas. While Du Bartas certainly learned the use of comparisons from Ronsard and the Pléiade, in the execution he gave them a flavor all his own. His discursive similes are not so uniformly borrowed from antiquity as are those of Ronsard, and the enthusiasm with which he embarks on a new train of thought often leads him to add details so peculiar to the comparison that the natural attempt on the part of the reader to relate them to the narration sometimes produces that impression of grotesqueness which has so often been criticized in his work. A striking example of the discursive simile is to be found in the story of Lot who, freed from the hands of the Elamites, goes into battle with the enthusiasm of a young colt which has escaped from the stable:

> Ainsi le fier poulain de l'estable eschappé
> Bat les vents de sa teste, et de son crin hupé
> Revoit les prez cheris, faict cent bonds, cent ruades,
> Dans son ombre courante admire ses bravades,
> Dresse sa forte queue, et parmi les jumens
> Faict retentir les monts d'aigus hennissemens.[12]

It is obvious here that Du Bartas' pleasure in describing a frisky young colt has made him forget Lot for the moment. Lot's joy at being freed has suggested the comparison, but the details of the comparison apply to the colt and certainly give a grotesque picture when applied to Lot.

A more typically Homeric comparison of the discursive type, because it is less graphic than the one just quoted, is to be seen in Du Bartas' comparison of the spreading of rumor to the voices of crickets:

> . . . les renoms parleurs, les bruits aux peintes aeles,
> Des quatre coins du monde aportent des nouvelles,
> Piolans là dedans, ainsi que les grillons
> Qui, taschans imiter les chantres oisillons,
> Envoyent, importuns, sur la fraische seree
> Dix mille voix du fond des fentes d'une pree.[13]

This comparison is Homeric not only in the wealth of detail which applies to the image of the comparison rather than to the circumstances

[12] *The Works of Guillaume de Salluste, Sieur Du Bartas*, Holmes, Lyons, Linker ed. (Chapel Hill, 1935-40), III, "Vocation," lines 719-24. In line 721 the Holmes edition reads "pieds"; the correct reading "prez" (prés) is found in the Chouët 1608 edition.

[13] Holmes ed., III, "Loy," lines 41-6.

which inspire it, but also because of the simile within a simile. The rumors are compared to crickets, which in turn are compared to birds (*oisillons*). The simile would be complete if the line "qui, taschans . . ." were omitted completely. That line serves to develop and complete the comparison itself; it adds nothing to the comprehension of the narration.

The digressive similes in Du Bartas are far outnumbered by those of the parallel type which he customarily develops with great care. And not only is the parallelism considerably developed, but the length to the simile is frequently exactly the same as the passage of the narrative which it illustrates. An excellent example of this type occurs in the *Quatriesme Jour* where Du Bartas compares the sun to an earthly monarch:

> Œil du jour, si je dy que tout ainsi qu'un prince,
> Qui, plain de majesté, rode par sa province,
> Est entourré de ducs, de comtes, de barons,
> Voit derriere et devant marcher les escadrons
> Des archers de sa garde, et n'a rien en sa bande
> Que sa sainte grandeur ne rende encor plus grande:
> Toy de mesme, rouant au tour de l'univers,
> Qui ne vit que du feu de tes aspects divers,
> Six grands princes du ciel, trois devant, trois derriere,
> Accompagnent, vassaux, ton char porte-lumiere,
> Outre l'ost brillonnant du ciel plus haut monté,
> Qui de toy ne reçoit pour solde que clarté.[14]

The description of the prince occupies six verses, exactly the same number as that of the sun. The two parts are separated by a colon which acts as a sort of fulcrum to balance them. And within the two parts each detail of one is balanced by a detail of the other:

un prince	toy (le soleil)
plain de majesté	ne vit que du feu
rode par sa province	rouant au tour de l'univers
entouré de ducs . . .	six grand princes . . . accompagnent
derriere et devant	trois devant, trois derriere,
escadrons des archers	l'ost brillonnant
sainte grandeur	clarté

It must be emphasized that this simile is not at all exceptional. Others of its type occur with great frequency, all exhibiting the same meticulous attention to detail, the same balance between the parts, the same punctuation; it is apparent that this type of simile was a particular favorite with Du Bartas.

In spite of his predilection for the parallel type of simile, Du Bartas, as has been shown, made occasional use of the discursive type, and also to some extent of the comparison by implication. Although less frequent than the others, the similes of this last type are particularly effective

[14] Holmes ed., II, "Quatriesme Jour," lines 519-30.

through the vividness of their imagery. Toward the end of the *Cinquiesme Jovr* Du Bartas relates, after Belon and Pliny, the story of the virgin and the eagle. He describes the girl finding the eaglets in the nest; then he writes:

> De ces deux oiselets le plus bel elle prend,
> Le met dedans le sein, du mont aspre descent,
> Puis, tremblant de frayeur, fuit d'une jambe ailee:
> Tout ainsi que le loup qui a ravy d'emblee
> L'honneur d'un gras troupeau, à chef baissé s'enfuit,
> *Et regarde en fuyant si le dogue le suit.*[15]

Here there is the attention to detail which is characteristic of Du Bartas, but without the parallelism of details which was shown in the last example. In this simile the poet indicates the wolf's fear of the dog by making him look back to see if the dog is following him. Nowhere does he say that the girl looks back to see if the eagle is following her, but we are made to understand that she does so by what is said about the wolf. The phrase "regarde en fuyant" applies to both the wolf and the girl, but the application to the latter is left to the imagination of the reader. The very fact that the parallel is not explicitly stated makes its effect more forceful; the reader can see the girl looking back much more clearly than if Du Bartas had said in so many words that she did. The line in the text which follows the last line quoted does not begin with "ainsi" or "tout de même," as the parallel similes ordinarily do, but starts an entirely new development:

> L'aigle est avec le temps si dextrement instruitte . . .

It is evident that in the sixteenth century the Homeric simile was first considered as a mere ornament,[16] and in the usage of Ronsard and Du Bartas the discursive simile—the type most characteristic of the simile in antiquity—remained largely an ornament. But the parallel simile and the simile by implication are by their nature bound closely to the narrative and tend, in the philosophical and epic poetry of the poets under discussion, to be a didactic instrument. In the case of Ronsard the use of these two types of simile becomes more and more frequent as the poet turns largely away from the odes and the *Amours* to the serious poetry of the *Hymnes*, the *Franciade*, and the *Discours*. In Du Bartas it is abundantly clear that similes are used to make abstract ideas or abstruse scientific information more clear and more understandable to the reader. Furthermore, by extending the frame of reference, by multiplying the images through the medium of the extended

[15] *Ibid.*, "Cinquiesme Jour," lines 933-8.

[16] A comparison of the similes in the early "Ode à Michel de l' Hospital" (1552; written probably in 1550 according to Laumonier) and those of the *Hymnes* (1555 and 1556) bears out this observation.

comparison, Du Bartas even more than Ronsard is able to produce extraordinarily vivid visual, auditory, and even tactile images. The Homeric simile, originally borrowed because of its decorative possibilities, has become in the hands of the Renaissance poets a means of expressing both their intellectual and their sensual reactions to the material world. If it is not strictly accurate to say that the men of the Renaissance "rediscovered" the material world, it is surely true to say that they reacted to it with an enthusiasm and a vitality which had long been unknown, and it is in part through the medium of the Homeric simile that this enthusiasm and this vitality have been communicated to us.

University of Washington

ALBERT CAMUS' *CALIGULA*: ANCIENT SOURCES AND MODERN PARALLELS

WALTER A. STRAUSS

CAIUS CAESAR CALIGULA, the third of the Roman Caesars, reigned four years, from A.D. 37 to 41. His nickname Caligula stems from the word *caligae*, meaning "army boots"; Caius wore them in his childhood, when he was brought up among soldiers. Caligula's life history is relatively well known to us, since we have the full accounts of Suetonius and Dio Cassius, fragmentary materials by Tacitus and Seneca, and incidental treatment by Philo Judaeus and Flavius Josephus. Some of these works show certain divergences as to facts and interpretations; but the consensus is that Caligula was a gentle though nervous young man who, after several months on the throne, turned tyrant almost overnight and finally fell prey to a conspiracy. The historians assert that Caligula was of delicate health; some go so far as to claim that he was subject to epileptic fits at one stage of his life.

The attitude of historians toward Caligula is well summarized in Baring-Gould's *The Tragedy of the Caesars*:

> Early indulgence of his every appetite had fatigued and enervated both his physical powers and his brain, so that his condition when not that of absolute insanity was one that hovered on the verge, and occasionally passed into sheer madness.[1]

There is nothing really baffling about this neurasthenia. The perplexing event in Caligula's history occurred after he had been on the throne for eight months. Up to that time his reign had been enlightened and generous: he had freed state prisoners, recalled the banished, and made certain progressive changes in the judicial system.

During the same period Caligula formed a scandalous attachment to his favorite sister Drusilla, which he climaxed by announcing his intention to marry her. Even in Rome, where no one was particularly squeamish on the subject of personal morals, this callous proposal was received unfavorably. Caligula's stubborn temperament would have continued the battle for a while, but Drusilla's unexpected death provided the denouement. The loss of Drusilla upset Caius completely; he contracted a sudden illness from which he emerged a changed man. The transformation was so remarkable that Suetonius felt compelled

[1] Sabina Baring-Gould, *The Tragedy of the Caesars*, II (New York, 1892), 3.

to inject a new note into his biography of Caligula: "Thus far we have spoken of him as a prince. What remains to be said of him bespeaks him rather a monster than a man."[2]

Albert Camus begins his play at this point of Caligula's life. Dishevelled and dirty, the young emperor returns to his palace after an absence of three days following Drusilla's death. Caligula has suddenly come to the realization that life is absurd; this overwhelming discovery, not the loss of Drusilla, precipitates his derangement. He is imbued with the conviction that, in order to surmount this absurdity and find genuine happiness, he must achieve the impossible: he must gain possession of the moon.

> Je voulais la lune... Je me suis senti tout d'un coup un besoin d'impossible... Ce monde tel qu'il est n'est pas supportable. J'ai donc besoin de la lune, ou du bonheur, ou de l'immortalité, de quelque chose qui soit dément peut-être, mais qui ne soit pas de ce monde . . . C'est parce qu'on ne le tient jamais jusqu'au bout que rien n'est obtenu. Mais il suffit peut-être de rester logique jusqu'à la fin...[3]

This bitter determination to be logical to the very end unleashes the action of the play. Caligula entrusts his faithful Helicon with the task of literally bringing the moon to him. He rejects the importunities of his mistress Caesonia in favor of the new logic to which he is committed. The new regime, with its essential components, "des spectateurs, des victimes, et des coupables,"[4] is clangorously ushered in when Caligula beats the gong in wild frenzy.

Caligula's excesses of cruelty and corruption take their toll; he has placed all important citizens of the Empire under threat of execution; the state has been made the legatee of all fortunes, and Roman noblemen are liquidated in accordance with a list prepared at random. This is Caligula's method of shocking the people into a realization that their lives are arbitrary and absurd; and this illumination is designed to force each individual to re-examine his very existence. Instead of the desired result, however, the new order gives rise to a conspiratorial movement composed of bereaved and frightened patricians. Its leader is Cherea, who has assumed the responsibility of the revolt, not because he fears Caligula, but because he understands him; and, understanding him, he feels obligated to eliminate him. For he knows that Caligula's danger lies, not in his megalomania, but in his readiness to use absolute power to promote a form of nihilism that no human being can endure. " . . . voir se dissiper le sens de cette vie, disparaitre notre raison d'exister, voilà ce qui est insupportable. On ne peut vivre sans raison . . . "[5] The second in command is Scipio, a young poet and former friend of Caligula, whose artistic inclinations had attracted him to the younger

[2] C. Suetonius Tranquillus, *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, tr. by Alexander Thomson (London, 1914), p. 265.
[3] Albert Camus, *Le Malentendu, suivi de Caligula* (Paris, 1947), pp. 109-110.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 124.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 130-131.

man; only after Caligula orders the execution of Scipio's father is the friendship abruptly terminated.

Caligula bursts into the midst of the conspiratorial proceedings, taking a fiendish pleasure in taunting and humiliating the revolutionists. He orders Helicon to read them a paragraph from his treatise on execution, called *The Sword* (*Le Glaive*):

On meurt parce qu'on est coupable. On est coupable parce qu'on est sujet de Caligula. Or, tout le monde est sujet de Caligula. Donc, tout le monde est coupable. D'où il ressort que tout le monde meurt.[6]

Somewhat later, Caligula, still proceeding with the same rigorous logic, proclaims himself a terrestrial divinity.

J'ai prouvé à ces dieux illusoires qu'un homme, s'il en a la volonté, peut exercer, sans apprentissage, leur métier ridicule . . . J'ai simplement compris qu'il n'y a qu'une façon de s'égaler aux dieux: il suffit d'être aussi cruel qu'eux.[7]

Caligula has now attained the climax of absurd logic; only the moon is still lacking ("Je n'ai pas encore épuisé tout ce qui peut me faire vivre"[8])—but alas! Helicon has not yet been successful in obtaining it for him. The emperor is beginning to sense the tragic ending which he has been building up for himself; yet, since he is committed to unalterable logic, "il faut aller jusqu'à la consommation."[9] Not only has this pursuit of the moon plunged him into despair, but it has also isolated him from others. Scipio has abandoned him; Caesonia has remained loyal but does not comprehend; and Cherea, the only person who completely understands him, the only person in whose presence Caligula can relax and be natural, is conspiring against him because he is convinced that Caligula must be eradicated.

Finally, the time for the coup is ripe. Shortly before, Scipio, who has come to understand Caligula too well, abandons the conspiratorial circle. And Cherea sadly remarks that Caligula's power to pervert Scipio's mind would alone be sufficient reason for doing away with him. Caligula also realizes that the end is near. "Soyons justes," he says to Caesonia, "je n'ai pas seulement la bêtise contre moi, j'ai aussi la loyauté et le courage de ceux qui veulent être heureux."[10] Caesonia too must pay the price for being implicated in Caligula's contemptuous logic: she is slowly strangled by her lover. Caligula, now completely alone, once more surveys the path on which his absurd logic has led him; he, too, is guilty, like all his subjects, for he has not gained the moon, and his quest for the impossible has ended in failure.

Si j'avais eu la lune, si l'amour suffisait, tout serait changé. Mais où étancher cette soif? Quel cœur, quel dieu auraient pour moi la profondeur d'un lac? . . . Rien

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 143.
[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 165-166.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 171.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 176.
[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 205-206.

dans ce monde, ni dans l'autre qui soit à ma mesure . . . L'impossible! Je l'ai cherché aux limites du monde, aux confins de moi-même . . .[11]

The conspirators rush in and kill him. His last words are hurled at them defiantly: "Je suis encore vivant!"[12]

This tableau of Caligula's dreams and deeds is by no means a figment of Albert Camus' imagination. Camus has drawn lavishly on Suetonius and has possibly consulted some of the other chroniclers of Caligula. His ingenious use of ancient sources and his ability to weave them dramatically into the pattern of his tragedy throw a good deal of light on his creative genius.

Almost all the important characters in the play are historically documented: Caligula, Caesonia, Cherea, and Helicon. Helicon is not mentioned in Suetonius or in Dio Cassius; but appears in Philo Judaeus, who describes him as "an accursed and infamous slave" who "attended upon and courted Caius, never leaving him for a moment."[13] In the case of Scipio, Camus has done some imaginative historical interpolating. The histories mention no Scipio in connection with Caligula or the conspiracy, but there was a P. Cornelius Scipio who attained distinction during the reign of Claudius, Caligula's successor. This Scipio must have been a young man in Caligula's day.

A closer look at Camus' use of the sources will be found illuminating. The cases in which the borrowings from Suetonius are more or less verbatim will be considered first. At the beginning of the play, Caligula, after three days of vagrancy, returns ragged and unkempt. Suetonius reports that, after Drusilla's death, "being inconsolable under his affliction, he went hastily and in the night-time from the city; . . . and then suddenly returned without shaving his beard, or trimming his hair . . ."[14] Caligula's extremely neurotic condition manifested itself in the form of insomnia and general restlessness. This information is found in Suetonius, and is echoed in *Caligula* by Caesonia:

Suetonius	Camus
What most of all disordered him was want of sleep, for he seldom had more than three or four hours' rest in a night . . . Being therefore often weary with lying awake so long, sometimes he sat up in bed, at others walked in the longest porticoes about the house . . .[15]	. . . cet homme dort deux heures toutes les nuits et le reste du temps, incapable de reposer, erre dans les galeries de son palais.[16]

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 210.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 211.
[13] Philo Judaeus, *Works*, tr. by Charles Duke Yonge, vol. IV, chap. xxvi, "On the Virtues and Office of Ambassadors. Addressed to Caius," pp. 136-137.
[14] Suetonius, p. 268 (chap. xxiv).
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 285 (chap. 1).
[16] Camus, p. 196.

Camus uses this restlessness as a theme in his portrait of the emperor. In the play Caligula is constantly darting in and out of the scene; he crouches and grimaces, displays atrocious table manners, and is in general surcharged with nervous tension. This "anxiety" was evidently a very real characteristic of Caligula. Philo Judaeus attests it in the account of his embassy to the emperor:

> And when we began to reply to him . . . he . . . cut us short and ran forward and burst into the principal building . . . And when we began to connect our reply with what we had said before, he again ran on and went into another house . . .[17]

From the multitude of Caligula's cruelties, as reported by Suetonius, Albert Camus has picked a few. Thus the famous dictum, "Tue-le lentement pour qu'il se sente mourir," has been lifted bodily out of the *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*. Caligula's order to create a famine harks back to Suetonius: "Sometimes shutting up the public granaries, he would oblige the people to starve for a while."[18] Moreover, his execution of the patrician whose sycophancy led him to vow his life to Jupiter in return for Caligula's recovery from an upset stomach is derived from Suetonius, even to the point of adhering to the exact cause of the indisposition and to the exact time (the night of the murder of Caligula).

In keeping with Caligula's restlessness and his preoccupation with problems of his own existence, Camus has worked into his play a number of scenes in which Caligula holds soliloquies in front of the mirror or contemplates his image contemptuously. Suetonius provided the source for this device: "His countenance, which was naturally hideous and frightful, he purposely rendered more so, forming it before a mirror into the most horrible contortions."[19]

Caligula's pretensions to "replacing the gods" are reported by most of the historians. Suetonius informs us that he "sometimes . . . appeared in the habit of Venus . . . He was extremely fond of singing and dancing . . . A night exhibition which he had ordered the day he was slain was thought to be intended . . . to make his first appearance upon the stage."[20] At the beginning of Act III of the play, Caligula appears in Venus costume; and in Act IV (the night he was murdered) he dances before the patricians.

Finally, the contemptuous and absurd last words of Caligula, "Je suis encore vivant!" are suggested by Suetonius' "As he lay on the ground, crying out that he was still alive, the rest dispatched him with thirty wounds."[21]

The passages which Camus has adapted from Suetonius and made

[17] Philo Judaeus, IV, 178.
[18] Suetonius, p. 270 (chap. xxvi).
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 285 (chap. 1).
[20] *Ibid.*, 287 (chaps. lii, liv).
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 291 (chap. lviii).

to serve his own purposes in *Caligula* are even more interesting. For instance, the emperor's lunatic disposition is reported in Suetonius: "On nights when the moon was full he was in the constant habit of inviting her to his embraces and his bed."[22] Camus has ingeniously transformed the moon into an existential symbol. There is, however, a passage in *Caligula* in which Suetonius is even more closely approached. It occurs when Caligula muses about having "possessed" the moon "one beautiful August night":

Elle a franchi le seuil de la chambre et avec sa lenteur sure, est arrivée jusqu'à mon lit, s'y est coulée et m'a inondé de ses sourires et de son éclat.[23]

No less adroit is Camus' use of the following statement:

... Two books which were found in Caligula's cabinet after his murder under different titles, one being called *The Sword*, and the other, *The Dagger*. They both contained ... the names of those who were destined to die.[24]

Camus uses the title *Le Glaive* for Caligula's treatise on execution, which contains the famous "absurd syllogism" mentioned above.

In Act IV Caligula assembles the poets for a contest, giving them one minute in which to compose a poem on the subject of death. The whole scene is steeped in an atmosphere of unreality, of brutality mechanically administered, and is reminiscent of such fantasies as Alfred Jarry's *Ubu-Roi*, of David Rousset's reflections on concentration camps, and of Kafka's hallucinatory universe. At the end of the contest the defeated poets are ordered to file past Caligula, licking their verses off their tablets. Again, this sequence was inspired by Suetonius:

He likewise exhibited public diversions ... besides a contest for preeminence in the Grecian and Roman eloquence; in which we are told that ... those who performed the worst were forced to blot out what they had written with a sponge or their tongue ...[25]

Nor are Caligula's economic schemes figments of Camus' imagination. His system of enriching the public treasury by making up arbitrary blacklists of the wealthy is adapted from Suetonius: "He also set aside the wills of all others, if any person only pretended to say that he designed at their death to leave Caesar their heir."[26] In another instance, Camus enhances a passage from Suetonius with Caligula's own morbid humor (which, incidentally, is an integral feature of his style in *Caligula*, serving to heighten the effect of the "absurd irony" of the play):

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 266 (chap. xxii).
[23] Camus, p. 171.
[24] Suetonius, pp. 284-285 (chap. xlix).
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 264 (chap. xx).
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 278 (chap. xxxviii).

Suetonius	Camus
To leave no sort of gain untried, he opened brothels in the Palatium, with a number of cells, furnished suitably to the dignity of the place . . . He sent likewise his nomenclators about the forums and courts, to invite people of all ages, the old as well as the young, to his brothel, to come and satisfy their lusts; . . . clerks attending to take down their names in public, as persons who contributed to the emperor's revenue.[27]	Caligula, crée une nouvelle décoration . . . cette distinction constituera l'Ordre du Héros civique. Elle récompensera ceux des citoyens qui auront le plus fréquenté la maison publique de Caligula . . . La récompense est décernée chaque mois, après vérification des bons d'entrée; le citoyen qui n'a pas obtenu de décoration au bout de douze mois est exilé ou exécuté.[28]

At the dinner with the conspirators in Cherea's house, Caligula gives a gruesome demonstration of how to humiliate one's adversaries. Among other things, he orders one of the men to bring him his wife, whom he promptly takes into the next room; then he returns and nonchalantly resumes his meal. Here again the report of Suetonius has been slightly altered to serve Camus' designs: "As often as he was in the humor, he would quit the room, send for her he liked best, and in a short time return with marks of recent disorder about them."[29] Similarly, the poisoning of the conspirator Mereia in the play recalls Caligula's murder of his cousin Tiberius. The situation is identical. Caligula, after a meal, observes Tiberius (Mereia) drinking some cough medicine. He accuses him of taking an antidote to neutralize the poison in the food and forces him to take poison. In the play, Caesonia identifies the vial which Mereia used as containing cough medicine. "Cela revient au même. Un peu plus tôt, un peu plus tard,"[30] is Caligula's sole comment.

Finally, Caesonia's strangulation by Caligula is suggested by a sentence in Suetonius. "Now and then Caligula would threaten to put his dear Caesonia to the torture, that he might discover why he loved her so passionately."[31]

The foregoing are the most striking examples of Camus' use of Suetonius. The passages show how adeptly Camus borrowed certain data from Suetonius and worked them into his drama with or without alteration. In each case the borrowed material has been integrated into the structure and the ideas of the play without marring the texture with pedantry or tedium. Indeed one would be tempted to believe that Camus had invented all his materials because they cohere so excellently.

Camus has, however, skillfully superimposed his own interpretation and fashioned *Caligula* into a vehicle for his philosophy. To get the

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 280 (chap. xli).
[28] Camus, pp. 144-145.
[29] Suetonius, p. 277 (chap. xxxvi).
[30] Camus, p. 148.
[31] Suetonius, p. 275 (chap. xxxiii).

proper perspective of this pattern, we must examine the characters of the play and discover what they stand for. The difference between Suetonius' Caligula and that of Camus may be brought into relief by an opinion of Diderot, who was familiar with the classical Caligula: "La jouissance d'une liberté qui pourrait s'exercer sans motif serait le véritable caractère d'un maniaque."[32] Camus has given Caligula a motive—a revolt against the absurdity of the world, and an attempt to crush it by accomplishing something impossible, such as gaining possession of the moon. One of the tragedies of Caligula's life lies in the fact that his power is absolute. "Si Caligula n'eût été que le fils d'un cordonnier de Rome, il n'eût jamais tué que des mouches," commented Diderot.[33] True enough, except that for Camus even the son of a cobbler might become aware of the absurdity of life (cf. Meursault in *L'Etranger*). The entire pattern of Caligula's life, characterized by the violence of his temperament and the vastness of his power, is geared toward absoluteness, and his philosophy of the absurd is its expression. Caligula, committed to the inexorable logic of his absurdist dialectic, which admits of no compromise, is doomed to misery and eventual destruction. Camus, emphasizing the emperor's singularity, has surrounded him with three characters who establish a point of contact with him because they understand—and disapprove.

The least complex of these is Caligula's mistress, Caesonia, who asserts the simple claim of love over that of logic; she is put in her place by Caligula: "Et ne peux-tu imaginer qu'un homme pleure pour autre chose que l'amour? . . . Les hommes pleurent parce que les choses ne sont pas ce qu'elles devraient être."[34] Caesonia's acquiescence to Caligula's logic constitutes her own tragedy; in Caligula's final isolation even she becomes superfluous, even love becomes useless.

The case of Scipio is much more complex. During the earlier part of the play, Scipio explains to Caesonia his attachment to Caligula:

> Je l'aime. Il était bon pour moi. Il m'encourageait et je sais par cœur certaines de ses paroles. Il me disait que la vie n'était pas facile, mais qu'il y avait *la religion, l'art, l'amour* qu'on nous porte.[35]

Just as Caesonia embodies the mitigating force of love and Cherea the consolation of faith, Scipio incarnates purification through art. "Tu es pur dans le bien, comme je suis pur dans le mal,"[36] Caligula tells him after he has alienated him. Scipio has learned only too well the lesson which Caligula wanted to teach people by shocking them into reflection. For Scipio the execution of his father was an end (of his devotion to

[32] Diderot, *Jacques le fataliste* (Pléiade ed., Paris), p. 488.
[33] Diderot, *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, I (Paris, 1930), 290.
[34] Camus, p. 122.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 114. Italics mine.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 155.

Caligula) and a beginning (of his clairvoyance)—with the significant exception that he did not turn into a Caligula: he remained "pur dans le bien."

Scipio's exact position with respect to Caligula evidently raised a number of problems in Camus' mind. In the first version of the play Scipio was made second-in-command of the conspirators, rushing in at the end of the play to be among the first to plunge the dagger into the emperor. By assigning this function to Scipio, Camus made another transposition of historical fact—this one a little more far-reaching than the others—the second-in-command of the conspirators was actually named Cornelius Sabinus. Camus' revised version of *Caligula*, making a tacit bow to history, radically alters the position of Scipio in the drama. Young Scipio becomes "existentialized"; to the great chagrin of Cherea, he disassociates himself from the conspiracy, explaining:

Je ne puis être contre lui. Si je le tuais, mon cœur du moins serait avec lui . . . La même flamme nous brûle le cœur . . . Mon malheur est de tout comprendre.[37]

His final deed is to take leave of Caligula. "Je vais partir très loin chercher les raisons de tout cela."[38] He has preserved his purity, but his adjustment is somewhat ambiguous, since flight cannot constitute an answer to the absurd. The implication in Camus' mind seems to be that the artist is more precariously involved in the absurdity of life, and more likely to conceive of it in absolute terms, than the sentimentalist (Caesonia) or the reasonable man (Cherea).

The real counterpoise to Caligula is Cherea. He comprehends Caligula's ominous mission from the beginning.

Reconnaissons que cet homme exerce une indéniable influence. Il force à penser. Il force tout le monde à penser. L'insécurité, voilà ce qui fait penser. Et c'est pourquoi tant de haines le poursuivent.[39]

Nevertheless, Cherea does not hate him—until Caligula has been responsible for perverting Scipio's mind. Cherea, who had been convinced from the beginning of Caligula's harmfulness to the world, now has an additional motive for doing away with him. "Tu es gênant pour tous," he tells Caligula to his face. "Il est naturel que tu disparaisses."[40] It is natural because, even in an absurd world, one can neither live nor be happy by pursuing the absurd to its ultimate logical conclusion.

La plupart des hommes sont comme moi. Ils sont incapables de vivre dans un univers où la pensée la plus bizarre peut en une seconde entrer dans la réalité . . .[41]

Cherea exemplifies the moderate, the reasonable, the relativistic approach to "absurdism." The values he seeks are decency, security, good

[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 184-185.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 203.
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 189.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 178.
[41] *Ibid.*

health, and good sense. When Caligula argues that security and logic do not go hand in hand, Cherea replies: "Il est vrai. Cela n'est pas logique, mais cela est sain."[42]

Cherea, then, represents the answer to Caligula, and Caligula in the long run is overcome spiritually as well as physically. In this respect the play *Caligula* must be regarded as an early link in the chain of Camus' development as a thinker and as a writer. This chain begins with his four essays called *Noces* and with *Caligula*, and has continued through *Le Mythe de Sisyphe* and *L'Etranger* to *La Peste* and *L'Etat de Siège*. It is perhaps no coincidence that Camus, like his hero at the opening of the play, was twenty-five years old when he wrote *Caligula*. This suggests the possibility that Camus himself had undergone a shock at an early age; and one cannot help but recall that he was first threatened with tuberculosis at that period of his life. These facts may shed some light on his intense occupation with the dichotomy of death and life in *Noces*, *Caligula*, and *La Peste*. In *Noces* the values of the healthy and the innocent life are eulogized. This implies an attack on death, and one of the essays, "Le Vent à Djémila," is a dissection of death. "J'ai trop de jeunesse en moi pour pouvoir parler de la mort,"[43] Camus exclaims. And yet he does speak of it, and the idea of death becomes a kind of metaphysical dynamite for him. All his heroic figures—Caligula, Maria in his play *Le Malentendu*, Meursault in *L'Etranger*, Dr. Rieux in *La Peste*, Diego in *L'Etat de Siège*—are shaken into a consciousness of the absurd because they themselves come into contact with death, because they become aware of being themselves "condemned to death."

For Camus the only escape from cosmic absurdity lies in the proud and contemptuous admission of its actuality; this attitude in itself constitutes a sort of happiness. Cherea and Dr. Rieux have made this adjustment; Scipio may eventually make it; Meursault at last becomes aware of the "tender indifference" of the universe. Only for Caligula the indifference simply *exists*, devoid of values. When Cherea tells him that he believes that there are some actions which are more beautiful than others, Caligula curtly replies, "Je crois que toutes sont équivalentes."[44] But he fails to realize that only the *consequences* of actions are equivalent. For, as Camus insists in *Le Mythe de Sisyphe*:

> Tout est permis ne signifie pas que rien n'est défendu. L'absurde . . . ne recommande pas le crime, ce serait puéril, mais il restitue au remords son inutilité. [Cf. Camus' insistence in *Noces* and *L'Etranger* that he does not know what "sin" means.] De même, si toutes les expériences sont indifférentes, celle du devoir est aussi légitime qu'une autre. On peut être vertueux par caprice.[45]

---

[42] *Ibid.*
[43] Camus, *Noces* (Paris, 1947), pp. 35-36.
[44] Camus, *Caligula*, p. 179.
[45] Camus, *Le Mythe de Sisyphe* (Paris, 1942), p. 94.

In *Le Mythe de Sisyphe* Camus makes it clear that the absurd acts as a bond between the world and man. "Il les scelle l'un à l'autre comme la haine seule peut river les êtres."[46] And only by discerning this fact clearly, and by repudiating the absurd, can man attain the happiness that his own faculties allow him to attain. This happiness lies essentially in a newly found form of humanism.

La seule révolution à la mesure de l'homme devrait résider dans une conversion au relatif qui signifierait exactement fidélité à la condition humaine. La révolte contre le pouvoir absolu suppose toujours qu'on peut se passer de pouvoir absolu —c'est-à-dire s'arranger des pouvoirs relatifs qui nous sont concédés.[47]

Hence the most eloquent answer to Caligula is Sisyphus, the man condemned eternally to push a rock to the summit of a mountain from which it invariably rolls back. Camus, reminding us that myths were created to stimulate the imagination, muses upon the condition of Sisyphus at the moment when the rock has just escaped him. At that moment he rediscovers the absurd. "Sisyphe, prolétaire des dieux, impuissant et révolté, connait toute l'étendue de sa misérable condition : c'est à elle qu'il pense pendant sa descente."[48] But he does not remain there, as Caligula does ; for the discovery of the absurd as the link between man and the world also gives rise to a new happiness. It throws man's destiny upon his own shoulders.

Elle chasse de ce monde un dieu qui y était entré avec l'insatisfaction et le goût des douleurs inutiles. Elle fait du destin une affaire d'homme, qui doit être réglée entre les hommes.[49]

Thus Sisyphus resolves that "tout est bien," and Camus concludes, "Il faut imaginer Sisyphe heureux."[50]

Caligula, as we have seen, was transplanted from the world of Suetonius to the world of Albert Camus. But in this absurd cosmos of Camus he is not alone. There he encounters Kierkegaard, the heroes of Kafka, and certain personalities from Dostoevsky. To be sure, none of these are exactly like him, but almost all of them would sympathize with him in some measure.

The whole universe of Kafka's *Prozess* (The Trial)—the world in which everyone is guilty—is the same as that which Caligula attempted to create artificially. Cherea was well aware of its inexorability, and he perceived that in such a world human beings meet an end similar to that of Josef K.

---

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[47] Camus, "Remarque sur la révolte," *L'Existence*, ed. Jean Grenier (Paris, 1945), p. 19.
[48] Camus, *Le Mythe de Sisyphe*, pp. 165-166.
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 167.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 168.

. . . An K.s Gurgel legten sich die Hände des einen Herrn, während der andere das Messer ihm ins Herz stiess und zweimal dort drehte.[51]

These thoughts are echoed by Cherea:

La plupart des hommes sont incapables de vivre dans un univers où la pensée la plus bizarre peut en une seconde entrer dans la réalité—où, la plupart du temps, elle y entre *comme un couteau dans un cœur*.[52]

This "pensée la plus bizarre" is in a sense personified by the officer of the *Strafkolonie* (The Penal Colony) of Kafka. When the visitor, overwhelmed by the ghastly penal apparatus and its helpless victim, asks, "Aber dass er überhaupt verurteilt wurde, das weiss er doch?" the officer replies, "Auch nicht . . . "[53] Caligula himself could have uttered the statement which Kafka puts into the mouth of this same officer in the *Strafkolonie*:

Der Grundsatz, nach dem ich entscheide ist: Die Schuld ist immer zweifellos. Andere Gerichte können diesen Grundsatz nicht befolgen, denn sie sind vielköpfig und haben auch noch höhere Gerichte über sich.[54]

Caligula, in his less brutal moods, still moves parallel to Kafka's heroes, voicing views of the universe tinged with the same irony. Thus K., the land surveyor of *Das Schloss* (The Castle), after attempting to comprehend the intricacies of the castle bureaucracy, finds his investigations interesting because they reveal the confusion and arbitrariness of "the authorities":

Es unterhält mich nur dadurch, sagte K., dass ich einen Einblick in das lächerliche Gewirre bekomme, welches unter Umständen über die Existenz eines Menschen unterscheidet.[55]

But K.'s irony is never so morbid as that of Caligula, and eventually Kafka and Camus come to a parting of the ways. Kafka's heroes, persecuted by the absurd, while ceaselessly striving for clarity, never attain the state of clairvoyance that Sisyphus reaches. Their journey becomes all-important, their destination remains obscure. Hence, Kafka's aphorism, "Von einem gewissen Punkt gibt es keine Rückkehr mehr. Dieser Punkt ist zu erreichen."[56] It is the tragedy of K. and Josef K. to be sustained by hope; and this hope, becoming obsessive, prevents them from discerning the absurd pattern of existence and from attaining the quiet happiness that, for Camus, comes from renouncing the absurd.

---

[51] Franz Kafka, *Der Prozess* (New York, 1946), p. 239.
[52] Camus, *Caligula*, p. 178. Italics mine.
[53] Kafka, *Erzählungen und kleine Prosa* (New York, 1946), p. 187.
[54] *Ibid.*
[55] Kafka, *Das Schloss* (New York, 1946), p. 80.
[56] Kafka, "Betrachtungen über Sünde, Leid, Hoffnung und den wahren Weg," *Beim Bau der Chinesischen Mauer* (Berlin, 1931), p. 266.

Caligula also makes brief contact with Kierkegaard's Abraham; yet the latter surmounted by faith the absurd demand of an unreasonable God. Caligula's aspirations, though proceeding from a different point of departure, coincide with those of Abraham, when Kierkegaard says:

> Everyone of the great shall be remembered, but each became great in proportion to his *expectation*. One became great by expecting the possible, another by expecting the eternal, but he who expected the impossible became greater than all.[57]

But the closest parallels with Caligula are found in Kirillov and Stavrogin of Dostoevsky's *The Possessed*. As a matter of fact, Caligula is a strange mixture of the two—combining the mentality and logic of Kirillov with the temperament and youth of Stavrogin. The analogy of Caligula and Stavrogin should not be carried too far, although on the surface their criminality often seems equally vicious. Stavrogin's eventual downfall is due to his indifference and his inability to muster any greatness of soul, which would have rallied him to God, as it did Raskolnikov. In the note which Stavrogin wrote before he committed suicide, he contrasted himself with Kirillov. "... I can never believe in an idea to such a degree as he did. I cannot even be interested in an idea to such a degree."[58] Stavrogin, "petty and spiritless," resembles Caligula only inasmuch as he makes no value judgments regarding his actions. For him, everything is permissible, as it is for Ivan Karamazov and for the Caligula of Suetonius. Ivan Karamazov's immoralism is a form of revolt against the "eternal harmony" of the universe, which, upon closer inspection, is nothing but a framework of absurdities. "Let me tell you, novice," he exclaims to his brother Alyosha, "that the absurd is only too necessary on earth. The world stands on absurdities, and perhaps nothing would have come to pass in it without them."[59] So Ivan "hastens to give back his entrance ticket"[60] to the world, much in the same way in which Caligula, at the beginning of Camus' play, complains: "Ce monde, tel qu'il est fait, n'est pas supportable."[61] By a logical extension of this principle—"Ce monde est sans importance et qui le reconnait conquiert sa liberté ... Dans tout l'Empire romain, me voici seul libre"[62]—Caligula embarks on a vast scheme of demonstrating his freedom. ("C'est moi qui remplace la peste.")[63] Kirillov cherishes the same freedom—that of doing away with God and by that very act

[57] Søren Kierkegaard, *Fear and Trembling: A Dialectical Lyric*, tr. by Walter Lowrie (Princeton, 1945), p. 19.

[58] Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Possessed* (Modern Library ed., New York, 1936), p. 686.

[59] Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov* (Modern Library ed., New York), p. 288.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 291.

[61] Camus, *Caligula*, p. 110.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 121.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 195.

becoming God himself. "Kirillov est donc un personnage absurde, avec cette réserve essentielle qu'il se tue," comments Camus in *Le Mythe de Sisyphe*.[64] Kirillov's logic has the same uncompromising rigidity as that of Caligula:

> If God exists, all is His will and from His will I cannot escape. If not, it's all my will and I am bound to show self-will . . . I am bound to shoot myself because the highest point of my self-will is to kill myself with my own hands . . . Do you understand now that the salvation for all consists in proving this idea to every one? Who will prove it? I! I can't understand how an atheist could know that there is no God and not kill himself on the spot. To recognize that there is no God and not to recognize at the same instant that one is God himself is an absurdity, else one would certainly kill oneself. If you recognize it you are sovereign, and then you won't kill yourself but will live in the greatest glory. But one, the first, must kill himself, for else who will begin and prove it? So I must certainly kill myself, to begin and prove it.[65]

Kirillov's absurd logic ends in an absurdity—his suicide—just as Caligula's absurd logic ends in his assassination. "Kirillov doit donc se tuer par amour de l'humanité," says Camus,[66] and humanity, for its own sake, has to do away with Caligula. Their destinies meet—and neutralize each other. The philosophy of the absurd becomes transmuted and resurrected in the form of Sisyphus.

Even though the road from Suetonius to Dostoevsky and Kafka has been tortuous, even though Caligula eventually had to be replaced by Cherea and Dr. Rieux, Camus has only vindicated his statement that "la sagesse antique rejoint l'héroïsme moderne." By considering Suetonius' biography a framework of myth, and without doing violence to the facts reported, Camus has allowed his imagination to play upon the character of Caligula, to project him dramatically and philosophically into a situation which, thanks to Dostoevsky, Kierkegaard, and Kafka, we have come to think of as characteristically modern. Camus has not been content with giving us merely a tableau of the modern scene, but has earnestly attempted to shock us into discernment, and to help us to extricate ourselves.

Harvard University

---

[64] Camus, *Le Mythe de Sisyphe*, p. 144.

[65] Dostoevsky, *The Possessed*, pp. 627-629.

[66] Camus, *Le Mythe de Sisyphe*, p. 147. Cf. Camus' estimate of Kirillov with Henri Lubac's statement in *Le Drame de l'humanisme athée* (Paris, 1945), p. 332, "Kirillov est à la fois le théoricien et le practicien de l'humanisme athée."

AN IMITATION OF PERRAULT IN ENGLAND: LADY MARY WORTLEY MONTAGU'S "CARABOSSE"

ROBERT HALSBAND

AMONG the miscellaneous prose writings of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, the celebrated letter writer, is a brief essay in French entitled "Carabosse."[1] Her biographers as well as her editors (except for printing it) have disregarded what is certainly a brilliant *jeu d'esprit*, one which points up the distinctive position she occupies in the literature of Augustan England.

Her interest in French literature began at an early age. As a girl she had read widely, and no doubt soulfully, in the ponderous romances of d'Urfé, La Calprenède, and Mlle de Scudéry, then, at the end of the seventeenth century, going out of fashion. For the rest of her life she continued to read, and to write, in French, although naturally enough her literary interests shifted. When she read Mme de Sévigné's letters soon after their publication she considered them merely "pretty";[2] she found far more sympathetic the acerb maxims of La Rochefoucauld, although she once went to the trouble of challenging one of them with a long French essay.[3] Among the many French books which she owned there are no fewer than seven collections of *contes de fées*, their dates of publication ranging from 1708 to 1735.[4] Since she was born in 1689, her interest in fairy tales was obviously an adult one, as indeed it was with the *beaux esprits* on the other side of the Channel. And it was Perrault, first and greatest of the fairy-story *conteurs* whom she imitated in "Carabosse." From his *Histoires, ou Contes du Temps Passé, avec des Moralités* (1697), which she owned in the 1708 edition, she chose "La Belle au Bois Dormant," and converted it into a sophisticated personal essay.

Perrault's *conte*, so well known, hardly requires retelling except to single out the elements altered by Lady Mary. In Perrault, when the Queen wishes to show her gratitude for the birth of the Princess, she seeks out as godparents all the fairies (seven) who can be found in the

[1] Among the Wortley MSS (owned by the Earl of Harrowby), Vol. VII, ff. 290-293; first printed in her *Letters and Works*, 2nd ed., ed. Wharncliffe (1837), III, 333-335.

[2] *Letters and Works*, 3rd ed., ed. Wharncliffe and Thomas (1861), I, 499: [June, 1726].

[3] "Sur La Maxime de M. de Rochefoucault, qu'il y a des mariages commodes, mais point de délicieux," *ibid.*, II, 421-428.

[4] *Sales Catalogue*, Sotheby and Co., 1 August 1928, pp. 81-98.

kingdom, and when they appear rewards them with gifts: "On mit devant chacune d'elles un convert magnifique, avec un estui d'or massif où il y avoit une cuillier, une fourchette, & un couteau de fin or, garni de diamans & de rubis."[5] In "Carabosse," however, the mother appeals only to the good fairies, refusing to call the wicked, to bless her with a child. Then she invites them to the christening and prepares gifts worthy of them: "Donner des pierreries ou de l'or aux maîtresses des mines, auroit été leur faire un affront . . . " This is what she gives them instead: "Elle avoit ramassé par les soins infinis de beaux vers passionnés composés par des amants sincères, le portrait d'une belle religieuse qui n'avoit jamais pensé à l'amour profane, une phiole (très petite à la vérité) des larmes versées par une jeune & riche veuve seule dans son cabinet, & des livres de théologie qui n'avoient jamais ennuyé personne."[6] No wonder (as the piece continues) the fairies were astonished!

In Perrault's *conte* the fairy who makes the tragic wish is merely old and, like others, nameless; her anger is aroused because no gift has been prepared for her. In Lady Mary's version the wicked fairy, called Carabosse, makes an entrance that stresses her malevolence: ". . . on entendoit un bruit comme de cent canons déchargés à la fois, un sifflement comme de mille serpents furieux, & on vit descendre par la cheminée la fée Carabosse, montée à califourchon sur un énorme crapaud. Je ne veux salir mon papier par la description de sa figure, faite pour inspirer le dégoût et l'horreur." She makes this dramatic entrance immediately after the first fairy has bestowed her blessing, thus initiating another important innovation.

In Perrault the blessings are given in succession, one by each of the six fairies, while the seventh hides in order to save hers until after the wicked one has spoken. The Princess is awarded qualities of beauty, grace, and the mind of an angel, together with the ability to sing, to dance, and to play all instruments perfectly. Then the irritated fairy bestows her gift—that the Princess be pierced by a spindle and die—a curse which the last hidden fairy converts to a slumber of one hundred years.[7] In "Carabosse" each separate blessing is immediately nullified

[5] Perrault, *Contes . . . d'après les textes originaux*, ed. Dillaye (1880), p. 102.

[6] Both Pope and John Gay echo these paradoxical gifts in their verse: Pope in *The Rape of the Lock* (1713), Canto V, lines 113-120; Gay in "The Toilette, A Town Eclogue" (1716), lines 73-78 (ed. 1720). The fact that Gay's eclogue was first published in *Court Poems* (1716)—in which Lady Mary and, to some extent, Pope collaborated—shows the similarity to be no coincidence.

[7] In "Dornröschen," Grimm's *Märchen* No. 50, which is clearly derived from this one of Perrault, the account of the fairies (thirteen) and their gifts is similar: ". . . beschenkten die weisen Frauen das Kind mit ihren Wundergaben: Die eine mit Tugend, die andere mit Schönheit, die dritte mit Reichtum, und so mit allem, was auf der Welt zu wünschen ist." *Deutsche Märchen gesammelt durch die Brüder Grimm*, ed. Langewiesche-Brandt (1911), p. 158.

by the evil fairy; the effect is a glitter of paradox. When the infant is awarded a noble and touching beauty, Carabosse orders that she shall lose her beauty to smallpox at the age when she begins to feel its advantages. When she is awarded superlative virtues of intellect, Carabosse orders that this endowment shall attract enemies and make her the prey of fools. The riches of her father and husband—shall not be at her disposal. Her excellent health—shall make her undertake dangerous enterprises. Her ear and taste for music—shall remove her power to sing, so that she shall feel all the rage of desire without the capacity to satisfy it. And finally, her freedom from vice, misfortune, seeds of envy and avarice—shall be canceled by "un grand fonds de tendresse . . ." It is obvious that the alternation of blessings with curses serves Lady Mary as a device for clever antitheses and—as we shall see—for flattery of herself.

In Perrault the episode of the fairies and their gifts is the prelude to the main motif of the "sleeping beauty"; in "Carabosse" it is the *raison d'être* of the whole piece, for soon after the last horrifying wish—that the Princess shall be the victim of sentimentalism—the piece ends: the fairies leave in dismay, unable to remedy so much evil; the mother dies of sorrow; and the child grows more beautiful. Then Lady Mary concludes, parenthetically: "Ici le manuscrit est défectueux."[8]

When we realize that she is using the piece as a personal essay, we can understand why she ended it where she did. To be an innocent sleeping beauty waiting for a prince to awaken her was simply not her role in life. Like the infant in "Carabosse" she had been blessed with all the virtues and cursed with their attendant misfortunes—including the smallpox (in 1715-16), a father and a husband whose wealth she did not share, and a cleverness that won for her the immortal hatred of Pope. In a sense she used the piece as a canvas upon which to sketch her own spiritual portrait, and displayed in it the subtlety and cynicism which had been bestowed on her in real life.

She addressed the essay with a heading to her friend the Abbé Conti, savant and poet, whom she knew from 1715, when he visited London, until his death in 1749. Whether or not she actually sent it to him, it survives among her own papers. He was one who appreciated her intellectual virtuosity (to him she had addressed several of her Turkish Embassy letters), and he would of course know the *conte* well enough to applaud her imitation.

The simplicity of Perrault's *contes* is superficial. Actually his style—particularly if compared with that of the German *Märchen* which are

[8] This rather obvious literary device is taken literally by Lady Mary's ablest biographer, who calls the essay a fragment. George Paston [Emily Morse Symonds], *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and Her Times*, 2nd ed. (1907), p. 547.

derived from his *contes*— is very much characterized by the "Zeit—und Kulturkolorit des französischen 17ten Jahrhunderts,"[9] more specifically by a courtly style and etiquette.[10] These traits are emphasized in Lady Mary's imitation.

Why did she use the name of the wicked fairy as her title? Although the name is not used in Perrault, it is traditionally that of "la fée malfaisante . . . vieille, laide, méchante, rechignée, bossue . . . Sa baguette était la source d'où jaillissaient les mauvais dons";[11] and it specifically occurs in a variant of "La Belle au Bois Dormant" current in central France.[12] It serves to focus her piece as a paradoxical dialogue instead of a romantic fantasy.

In still another light, her piece is a specimen of English borrowing from French culture during the neoclassical period. In France, the *contes de fées*—which Emile Montégut call "la véritable création de la France dans l'ordre du merveilleux"[13]—had their greatest vogue from 1695 to 1700 in the Paris *salons*, where they were embellished with the trappings of heroic romances and *histoires secrètes*.[14] The only previously noticed reference to *contes de fées* in English literary materials of this general period is Swift's statement, in 1712, that he is reading some of the tales (probably those of Mme d'Aulnoy).[15] Lady Mary's crisp imitation is perhaps a unique example in England.[16]

If she borrowed from France in this case, she generously paid back, for her popularization of inoculation later inspired the *philosophes*,[17] and inspired Voltaire in particular to describe her as "une des femmes d'Angleterre qui a le plus d'esprit & le plus de force dans l'esprit."[18]

Hunter College

---

[9] Agnes Nordick, *Der Stil der Märchen Perraults* (1934), p. 47.

[10] Richard Benz, *Märchen und Aufklärung im 18. Jahrhundert* . . . (1907), p. 17.

[11] Pierre Larousse, *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIX^e Siècle*, n.d., III, 347.

[12] P. Saintyves [Émile Nourry], *Les Contes de Perrault et les récits parallèles, leurs origines* (Paris, 1923), p. 75.

[13] "Des fées et de leur littérature en France," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XXXVIII (1862), 659.

[14] Mary Elizabeth Storer, *La Mode des Contes de Fées (1685-1700)* . . . (1928), pp. vi, 109, 116-117.

[15] Robert E. B. Allen, *The Nature and Dissemination of the Marchen with Special Reference to the Cabinet des Fees* (An Abstract of a Thesis . . . for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy . . . in the University of Illinois, 1941), p. 11; Swift, *Journal to Stella*, ed. H. Williams (1948), p. 475.

[16] Pope's "machinery" of the sylphs in *The Rape of the Lock*, although it may seem similar to the material of the *contes de fées*, is actually derived from the Rosicrucian system as expounded in *Le Comte de Gabalis* (1670) by the Abbé de Montfaucon de Villars.

[17] Arnold H. Rowbotham, "The 'Philosophes' and the Propaganda for Inoculation of Smallpox in Eighteenth Century France," *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, XVIII, No. 4 (1935), 265-290.

[18] *Lettres Philosophiques* (1734), ed. Lanson (1909), I, 133.

SHAKESPEARE IN ITALY

N. ORSINI

I HAVE read with interest Professor Piero Rebora's paper, "Comprensione e fortuna di Shakespeare in Italia" in *Comparative Literature*, I (1949), 210-224. I think readers of the journal might be interested in the names of some of the scholars whose work is there referred to.

Professor Rebora stresses the possibility of the derivation of the *Tempest* from Italian popular comedy, and says that this derivation is "anche filologicamente accertabile" (p. 212). If so, credit is due to Professor Ferdinando Neri, who published the parallels to the *Tempest* in his small but invaluable volume, *Scenari delle maschere in Arcadia* (Città di Castello, 1913).[1] Professor Rebora makes special reference to "Calibano, l'*omo salvatico* cioè degli scenari dell'*Arcadia incantata*, che furono raccolti nel 1618 da Basilio Locatelli, ma fin dalla fine del secolo erano noti e rappresentati" (p. 212). Neri printed three of the scenarios of Locatelli and, in his introduction (pp. 33-41), discussed their relationship to the *Tempest*, showing that their subject matter could be traced as far back as a pastoral play printed in 1584 (p. 19). Neri also published the scenario of the play *Arcadia incantata* from a Neapolitan manuscript of the late seventeenth century, discovered by Benedetto Croce (p. 24), and in his discussion referred to the character "Salvatico" in the scenario, *Arbore incantato*, by Flaminio Scala (p. 34, note 2).

Professor Rebora mentions Vico's reference to English drama, with its possible implications:

> Credo che il solo spirito del tempo che avrebbe potuto dare giudizi molto più penetranti, se avesse direttamente conoscuito i drammi shakespeariani, sarebbe stato G. B. Vico... Vico, che aveva rivendicato la grandezza di Dante, giustamente paragona il "collerico ingegno" dei tragici elisabettiani alla grandiosa atrocità di Dante: "... comme oggi gli inglesi, poco ammolliti dalla delicatezza del secolo, non si dilettano di tragedie che non abbiano dell'atroce" [p. 216].

The reference had been noted by Croce in his book on Vico:

> Colui che scriveva questa pagina di critica dantesca, e rivendicava Dante dopo secoli di gusto anti-dantesco (o dantesco-grammaticale e dantesco-scolastico),

[1] For a more recent discussion, see K. M. Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy* (Oxford, 1934), II, 443-453.

e lo rivendicava proprio negli anni della fioritura arcadica così ritrosa e avversa a Dante, avrebbe meritato d'incontrarsi col genio di Guglielmo Shakespeare, che forse egli solo, a quei tempi, era in grado di intendere a pieno. Ma in Italia, come in generale fuori d'Inghilterra, dello Shakespeare allora non si conosceva nulla; e appena ne giungeva al Vico una tarda e vaga notizia, e cioè che gli inglesi, non ammolliti dalla delicatezza del secolo, non si dilettavano di tragedie che non avessero dell'atroce, appunto come il primo gusto del teatro greco fu delle nefarie cene di Tieste e dell'empie stragi compiute da Medea su fratelli e figliuoli.[2]

Professor Rebora mentions "le traduzioni complete di Angeli e dei tre volumi sansoniani (di diversi traduttori)" (p. 223). Credit for the latter translation—Shakespeare, *Teatro: Traduzioni sotto la direzione di Mario Praz* (Florence, 1943-46, 3 vols.)—is due to its general editor, Professor Praz, who incorporated and carefully revised previous scholarly translations (by G. S. Gargano, R. Piccoli, A. Zanco, and others) and new translations of the remaining plays by various hands. The result is the first scholarly translation of the complete plays in Italian, superseding all previous attempts. Professor Praz has since edited another useful volume of translations of drama in the age of Shakespeare: *Teatro elisabettiano: Kyd, Marlowe, Heywood, Marston, Jonson, Webster, Tourneur, Ford* (Florence, 1948).

Among the Shakespearian translators referred to, the late G. S. Gargano, of Florence, deserves to be remembered as a lifelong student of the English poet. His scholarly work lies scattered in periodicals—some of it is included in J. G. Fucilla, "Shakespeare in Italian Criticism," *Philological Quarterly*, XX (1941), 559-572. But he did publish one book embodying the results of his explorations of the Florentine archives for contemporary references to Shakespeare and Elizabethan drama: *Scapigliatura italiana a Londra sotto Elisabetta e Giacomo I* (Florence, 1923). The value and interest of this material was pointed out by Sir Edmund K. Chambers in his "Elizabethan Stage Gleanings," *RES*, I (1925), 185-186.

One might also recall that a contribution to one of the knottiest problems of Shakespearian criticism was made by Giovanni Ramello in his book, *Studi sugli apocrifi shakespeariani: The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke 1603* . . . (Turin, 1930)— a work which an expert like J. Dover Wilson considered "important" (*The Manuscript of Shakespeare's Hamlet*, I, xiii, note). A more recent addition to Shakespeare studies in Italy is the book by Professor Benvenuto Cellini, *Vita e arte nei sonetti di Shakespeare, col testo dei Sonetti riordinati e commentati* (Rome, 1943).

Since Professor Rebora mentions Antonio Conti (p. 213), it might be interesting to recall the remarkable effect, outside Italy, of this eighteenth-century Italian writer's appreciation of Shakespeare. It has

[2] Benedetto Croce, *La filosofia di G. B. Vico* (Bari, 1911), p. 227.

been shown by Professor J. G. Robertson that the Swiss critic Bodmer, whose influence on the development of the German romantic credo was profound, derived his appreciation of Shakespeare from Antonio Conti. Professor Robertson was put on the track of this discovery by noticing the curious spelling of the name "Sasper" in Bodmer—a distortion of "Shakespeare" that seemed to him more Italian than German. Following this clue he came upon Conti *(Il Cesare*, 1726) with his praise of the English Corneille, "Sasper." This led in turn to the discovery of still wider influences of Italian eighteenth-century criticism upon German thought. They are traced out in detail in Robertson's *Studies in the Genesis of Romantic Theory in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1923), one of the most interesting pieces of comparative research done in decades.

University of Wisconsin

BOOK REVIEWS

LES GÉNÉRATIONS LITTÉRAIRES. By Henri Peyre. Paris: Boivin, 1948. 266 p.

The author of this work is careful to point out that the idea of grouping artists and writers by generations is not new, but he also points out that, in this book, it is presented "avec plus de précisions, plus d'ampleur, et plus de souplesse qu'il ne l'avait été jusqu'ici en France." With this judgment we must fully agree. M. Peyre's book offers the student ample food for thought and testifies to painstaking and careful scholarship.

No one denies the importance of histories of literature or the fact that they are today of greater importance than ever before. As the author tells us, the reading public of our days is lacking in culture and needs reference works at every moment. Yet these reference works have obvious shortcomings, of which everyone is aware but about which very few have attempted to do anything. The first part of this book is concerned with pointing out these shortcomings, the second part with the presentation of a remedy, and the third part with illustrating the value of this remedy.

The easiest way to classify authors has always been to group them with the sovereign or the régime under which they lived. Thus in England we have the Victorian authors and the Elizabethan authors. But the danger of this is immediately apparent; "Victorian" has acquired a particular meaning which is far from being apt when applied to such authors as Pater, Wilde, Swinburne, or Hardy.

Historians of today have resorted to classifications according to important events which influenced the development of arts and sciences. These classifications, though they may be pertinent to one country, do not, however, always apply to another. Furthermore, historical dates do not always correspond with important literary dates. Thus 1789 is not in France a significant date as far as literature is concerned. Nor is June 18, 1815, the date of Waterloo. Nor for that matter is 1939. These historical dates are not to be neglected, but their influence on literature usually comes several years later. The classification of literary history should therefore not be made to fall arbitrarily into the historical pattern.

Most histories of literature and the arts have adopted classifications by periods determined by the predominance of certain psychological or aesthetic traits. This method is incomplete. For example, the author reminds us, Corneille, Pascal, and Descartes are neither classical nor baroque, yet they are of the so-called classical period. In the same way the romantic, realistic, and symbolist periods of the nineteenth century leave aside such writers as Renan, de Tocqueville, and Comte, and poets like Baudelaire and Rimbaud. This method is also fallacious in that it tends to give the idea that the particular trait which gave the period its name dominated that period exclusively. The very fact that books on the classicism of the French romanticists have been written is a proof of the fallacy. The greatest danger in this method, however, is that historians of one literature will tend to adopt the categories of other literatures for their own writers. Thus we have seen analogies proposed between French and English classicism, German and French romanticism, Austrian and Spanish baroque, etc., disregarding the fact that the elements of contrasts between different national literatures are of far greater importance than their exterior similarities. Moreover, there has arisen a mystical belief in constantly

recurring cycles of periods: primitive—classical—baroque; classical—romantic—realistic. Following this school of thought, Cazamian in his *Histoire de la littérature anglaise* (1924) tried to establish that the literature of modern England tends to oscillate between the two extremes of classicism and romanticism. He then attempted the same interpretation for French literature and suggested that the same could also be done for other literatures.

Another method of classification is to separate authors into movements, schools, or *cénacles*. This, says M. Peyre, takes account of the "désordre du réel" more than the others. Of the three terms, "school" conforms least to reality. For there was, in truth, no such thing as a "classical school," or a "romantic school," or, especially, a "symbolist school." The author's chief objection to this method is that it establishes too great an equality between the representative values of these denominations. Whereas romanticism invaded several provinces of literature and renewed our ways of thinking, symbolism and surrealism have influenced only poetry and painting. Moreover, with this method also, one would be tempted to ignore those writers who produced outside the schools and to give undue importance to the ones who loudly proclaim their adherence by manifestoes which, often enough, have no lasting values. This has happened in Italy (the futurists, the grotesques, the neo-classicists, etc), in Germany (Jung Wien, Geist und Tat, expressionism). France has been more guilty than other nations, and has set a bad example, which, unfortunately, has been followed too hastily. The author cites as a typical example the Parnassian school. Whereas there may have been one Parnassian, Leconte de Lisle, with possibly another, Hérédia, histories of literature list thirty-seven and proclaim that this "school"—in reality a feeble reaction against some aspects of romanticism—is an indispensable link between romanticists and symbolists.

Because of the afore-mentioned difficulties, historians have had recourse to another and easier division—that of centuries. This method of classification was popularized by Voltaire in his *Siècle de Louis XIV*. Unfortunately, although this division is a purely arbitrary one, we have accustomed ourselves to creating a collective personality for each century. Thus we expect the beginning of a century to furnish new and dynamic ideas, and we speak of an "esprit fin de siècle." This is so strongly fixed in our minds that it colors our judgment and discriminates against authors unluckily born after the half century. It seems, moreover, that French literature is the only one which by chance can be divided more or less accurately according to centuries. This cannot be shown in the case of Spanish, Italian, German, or English literatures. Even in French literature, if we are to follow rigorously the ideas of the specialists, the seventeenth century, for example, would be reduced to a space of some thirty years. We are thus led to classify the centuries according to the dominant movement and to say that the sixteenth century=the Renaissance, the seventeenth=classicism, and the eighteenth=the philosophical spirit. What will we call the nineteenth and the twentieth?

The time has come, says M. Peyre, to adopt a more truthful and accurate system of classification. According to him, this would be found in a classification by generations. In the nineteenth century those who were interested in linking man to his historical and sociological milieu were interested in this idea of generation, in the disparity found between succeeding generations, in the reasons for one furnishing a host of brilliant authors, thinkers, and artists, while another was singularly barren of any genius. Sainte-Beuve was thus led to propose, though timidly, such a classification.

Numerous others have used this method: in France, Jouffroy, Alfred de Musset, Balzac, Michelet, Renan, Taine. In Spain, José Ortega Gasset called it "el concepto más importante de la historia." In fact this concept is often used in Spain to desig-

nate a group of authors and thinkers who revealed themselves around 1898. The generation of 1898 was composed of men born between 1864 and 1871, who had their cafés and their manifestoes and whose creations present many elements of unity.

German scholars have also been attracted by the idea of generations. This interest goes back to Schlegel, who in 1812 distinguished three generations in the German literature of the second half of the eighteenth century: that of the Founders, 1750-1760; that of 1770 (Goethe, Stolberg, Voss, Buerger, Jacobi, Lavater, Herder, Johann Mueller), and that of Schiller and Kant and of the revolutionary era (1785-1800). Other scholars such as Ranke, Dilthey, Mannheim, and Pinder have further developed the idea.

In France, Mentré, Thibaudet, Pommier, and Jasinski have contributed a great deal to establishing this method of classification.

One advantage offered by the method is that it makes us perceive more clearly what the writers and artists who were born during the same period had in common. For, whether the artist revealed himself early or late in life, he nonetheless belonged to his generation; he grew up in the same atmosphere, was influenced by the same program of studies, the same political events. Thus, though La Fontaine made his literary début in the same period as Boileau and Racine, he is none the less the contemporary of Molière, Furetière, Cyrano, and Pascal. It is, moreover, between the ages of 16 and 28 that the influence of friendships and intellectual milieu are most important, and these are the dates, determined by the date of birth, that M. Peyre considers in establishing his groups of generations.

To illustrate his method, M. Peyre, has listed several groups of generations including writers, artists, and thinkers of France, Germany, Spain, England, and Italy and, separately, of the United States and Russia. For the five European literatures, he distinguishes eleven generations (A-K) for the period 1490 to 1660, and eighteen generations (L-CC) for the period 1660 to 1900. From this enumeration he draws several conclusions.

Classification according to generations respects "la multiple complexité du réel." It has a timely and practical value. It makes us think in new terms and brings attention back to badly neglected periods, while at the same time it sheds light on so-called secondary authors. Above all, the concept of generations invites us to study the authors in relation to the artists who were their contemporaries, to join together literary and political history. Finally, this concept is of value not alone for one literature but for all.

This is indeed a very lucid and stimulating book. If the method which M. Peyre so ably champions is accepted it will cause a much needed re-evaluation of the conventional labels and classifications.

JACQUES HARDRÉ

University of North Carolina

GUIDA A DANTE. By Umberto Cosmo. Torino: F. De Silva, 1947. 202 p.

A HANDBOOK TO DANTE STUDIES. By Umberto Cosmo, translated by David Moore. New York: Barnes & Noble, n.d. vi. 194 p.

This book was the last production of Umberto Cosmo. As he was finishing it—Franco Antonicelli informs us—a violent episode of the clandestine struggle broke his heart in his refuge of Corio Canavese. The *Guida a Dante* is the "testament" of a great dantologist.

The character of the book is wholly different from that of the guides penned, for initiatory purposes, by other Dante scholars. Absent are the philologism of Barbi, the symbolistic coruscations of Symonds, the reserved composure of Grand-

gent, the archival matter-of-factness of Friedrich Schneider, the sinuous and subtle, half-metaphysical, half-aesthetic, exegesis of Spoerri, the garrulous discursiveness of Maggini, the picturesque descriptions and the elegant psychologism of a mystical voluptuary like Louis Gillet; absent also are the *bonhomie*, dashed with deflating humor, of Alexandre Masseron, and his legerdemain in reducing the most involved, recalcitrant allegories and the *malae cruces* of Dante to formulas so simple and innocent-looking that a child could understand them.

This however, is a characterization by negations. An analysis of Cosmo's *Guida* must single out, instead, its positive aspects.

The outstanding points of superiority of the work derive from two individualizing facets of the psychological and intellectual personality of Umberto Cosmo. There was in him—first of all—a certain *danteitas*, so to speak: "he had always found in Dante [it is again Antonicelli who notes it] itineraries of similar experiences, between sorrows and hopes: and he thoroughly understood, within the poetry, the extremely rich life from which that poetry sprang."

The second point of superiority of Cosmo's *Guida* is the author's exceptionally deep knowledge of Dante's biography (see his *Vita di Dante*, undoubtedly the best among its modern congeners), coupled with his mastery of the bewildering labyrinth which is Dante scholarship (see *L'ultima ascesa*, Cosmo's great book on the *Paradiso*).

There is in Cosmo a more successful blend than in any other modern dantologist (except Mario Casella) of the historico-philologic with the aesthetic element. His plea for completeness of information never becomes micrological and peevish, but is always subordinated to some consequential, clearly pursued solution. His will to say, in the face of utterly desperate problems, *ignoramus et ignorabimus* (that is, his courage to be humble) is an ethically steeling motif. One may also point out Cosmo's conviction that the only avenue to knowledge is *scire per causas*: so that, in the ever-recommencing revision of the researches of one's predecessors, the supreme fruit to be gathered is the apprehension of the reasons which, in the light of the subsequent progress of scholarship, forced those men to deviate "from the right path." Above all, one feels that the conclusions reached by Cosmo are the outcome of years and years of mature re-elaboration, of acceptances and rejections decided upon only after the problem was scrutinized from all angles and the most rigorous attention given to antipodal interpretations.

Typical of Cosmo's attitude towards criticism in general, and towards Dante criticism in particular, is the way in which he poses the question of the respective importance to be attached, in Dante hermeneutics, to the cultural versus the aesthetic factor. Cosmo takes a decidedly anti-Vico, and consequently anti-Croce, position. "We must free ourselves from the prejudice that scholarship (I include in this term all forms of scientific thought) threw a chill over the imagination of the poet. Vico, such a great admirer of Dante, did, in this respect, fall into error. Scholarship did not chill anything: on the contary, it strengthened, sublimated—it created arrangement and order" (p. 173). "The *Commedia* is not, as Croce maintains, only a set of lyrical pieces variously intoned, against the background of a theological novel. It is an immense, compact poetical organism, concretizing in plastic form the solution which a high religious form, by voicing the aspirations of millions of men, has given for centuries to the problem of human destiny" (p. 141). This polemical attitude towards Croce is paralleled by a fervent but equitable recognition of the achievements of the *scuola storica* (Bàrtoli, D'Ancona, Carducci, Comparetti, del Lungo, Todeschini).

Cosmo stresses the importance, for the young dantologist, of mastering all the spiritual phenomena of Dante's time, especially the philosophical currents. But he

remarks that the study of the political and social history and of the language of that epoch are equally essential. One must keep always in mind, however, that these studies are ancillary to the understanding of Dante *qua* artist, *qua* poet.

Important suggestions as to fresh lines of historical research are given apropos of Gherardo da Camino (p. 82) and of the posthumous influence of the *De Monarchia*. One cannot but agree with Cosmo's opinion that a carefully wrought account of the *De Monarchia's* intellectual vicissitudes in centuries subsequent to the fourteenth would disclose significant information as to its purport and value (p. 120).

Worthy of attention are Cosmo's judgments on the standard works of Dante scholarship. Vossler is blamed for his insistence upon content, Zingarelli for his fanciful syntax; De Sanctis is profoundly admired, but with prudent reservations; D'Ovidio's and Barbi's productions are recommended as a tonic counteracting De Sanctis' influence.

The pivotal concept of the *Commedia*, according to Cosmo, is that of *ordo*. It unifies Dante's conception of the physical as well as of the ethical world.

On pp. 147-148, the problem of the genesis and the date of inception of the composition of the *Commedia* is tackled. Cosmo believes that the work was begun around 1307 or 1308, on Dante's return from Lucca to the Casentino; and that the poet, immediately prior to, or during, the first stage of composition, plunged into the reading of the apocalyptic book of the Franciscan friar Ubertino da Casale—a work all aglow with dreams and hopes of a spiritual palingenesis. While underscoring Dante's ideal evangelicalism, and his exaltation of Franciscan poverty, Cosmo holds that, philosophically speaking, Dante was never a Franciscan thinker. Substantially, in his stress on Dante's prophetism, Cosmo is close to Buonajuti, Nardi, Huck, and Baethge.

The bibliographies of the *Guida* are a marvel of judicious selectiveness and of erudite intelligence. Almost everything essential on Dante which had appeared up to 1947 is to be found; this, *per se*, would make of the *Guida* a precious volume. To Cosmo's bibliography on the *De Monarchia* should be added: Friedrich Bock, *Reichsidee und Nationalstaaten* (Munich, 1944), which deals with Dante's epoch down to 1341 (that is, from the decline of the ancient Reich to the announcement of the Anglo-German agreement of that date); and J. Lecher, "L'Argument des deux glaives," in *Recherches de Science religieuse* (Strasbourg, July 1932).

Moore's English translation is carefully done and will prove very useful to those who do not read Italian easily.

ELIO GIANTURCO

Washington, D. C.

HANDBUCH DER WELTLITERATUR. By Hans W. Eppelsheimer. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1947-50. 2 vols. 390 and 414 p.

Eppelsheimer's *Handbuch der Weltliteratur* is a second edition of a work which was first published in 1937. The original single volume has been expanded to two, brought up to date, and greatly improved. The book surveys world literature from the oldest Chinese writings down to our day by listing always only the most prominent authors, a selection from their writings, and a small choice of the literature on them. There are brief introductory comments. The book is useful, since it allows us to locate much information quickly and, on the whole, reliably. The sections on German and Romance literatures are elaborate and well-informed. But the book has many shortcomings, especially for the non-German user. The emphasis is heavily on German literature; even very minor German figures are listed when sometimes the great or the near-great authors of other nations are ignored. English literature is treated very unevenly. Thus the section on the

Renaissance, which contains such German authors as Wickram, Butzbach, and Platter, does not even mention Spenser or Sidney. The section on baroque literature has an odd English list: Milton, Butler, Otway, Fox, Bunyan, and Locke. Even if we take baroque as equivalent to "seventeenth century," which is a doubtful usage, any student moderately acquainted with English literature must notice the surprising absence of Dryden, Donne, and all the metaphysicals. In the eighteenth-century section there is no trace of Dr. Johnson or Boswell, and in the nineteenth century Hazlitt and Lamb, Jane Austen and Arnold "shine by their absence" (to use a German locution). American literature is treated with a better sense of proportion; but no poet after Whitman is represented. There are similar omissions from the other literatures which are hardly matters of opinion and taste. Poets and critics, especially, fare badly; one misses, e.g., all the modern Spanish poets since Darío, and critics of such eminence as Sainte-Beuve, Belinsky, Menéndez y Pelayo, and De Sanctis. One can, of course, argue on individual figures, but the disproportion seems excessive when we find Theodor Körner, Sealsfield, Klaus Groth, Rosegger, Scheffel, and many other strictly local German worthies treated in full.

The sections devoted to the Slavic literatures are also very deficient, e.g., the only Russian eighteenth-century author listed is Catherine the Great, though at least Lomonosov, Derzhavin, Sumarokov, Fonvizin, and Radishchev are far more important. Polish literature begins for Eppelsheimer only with Mickiewicz, and the doubtful opinion is quoted that Mickiewicz's visit to Goethe was the "symbol of Poland's entry into the Western sphere." It is hard to believe that Poland had belonged to the East before. In Czech literature even Jan Hus is missing, and Yugoslav literature is completely absent.

The selection of scholarship quoted is largely confined to treatments in German, with long lists of German translations. Very frequently, even the basic works in non-German languages are missing. If, e.g., we examine the section on English romantic literature, we find that none of the most valuable books on Blake are there: neither the biography by Mona Wilson nor the works by Foster Damon, Berger, Percival, Schorer, Frye, etc. The *Life of Shelley* by Newman I. White is missing. So is Lowes' *Road to Xanadu*, Dykes Campbell's *Life of Coleridge*, Elwin's *Landor*, Sackville-West's *De Quincey*, to mention only undisputably basic works. C. F. Harrold's *Carlyle and German Thought* is absent, though six inferior German items on the subject are given. If we look elsewhere things are no better; e.g., in the section on Ibsen even the *Life* by Halvdan Koht is missing and all of the critical literature in English (Weigand, Bradbook, Downs, etc.) except Shaw's *Quintessence of Ibsenism*. I will not even attempt to point out the gaps in things Slavic.

The book is largely a bibliography, but the short introductions contain frequently ambitious and even pretentious generalizations and evaluations. They are mostly laudatory or purely descriptive. Thus it seems out of place to include reflections on the supposed unoriginality and the Eastern political leanings of the Czechs (II, 170), especially since the author obviously has no firsthand knowledge of the literature. Comenius is listed among "Literature of the Baroque in *Germany*" without any explicit indication of the language in which he wrote his major works.

There are, considering the scope of the work, few factual errors. I notice, e.g., that Dostoevsky's place of death is given as Moscow instead of Petersburg, and Čapek's as London instead of Prague, that a large book on Coleridge-Taylor, the composer, appears under S. T. Coleridge, etc.; but, on the whole, the standard of accuracy seems very high. The useful compilation is marred by its excessively German bias not only in the space provided for German literature but in the scholarship listed and the opinions expressed. It can be recommended only with grave reservations.

R. W.

LA COSCIENZA DELLA RINASCITA NEGLI UMANISTI FRANCESI. By Franco Simone. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1949. 181 p.

Este volumen, cuidadosamente impreso, reune un haz de artículos esparcidos por varias revistas, todos con el tema fundamental de la conciencia que del Renacimiento tuvieron los humanistas que lo fomentaron, así como del establecimiento de la noción de un período floreciente, opuesto a otro anterior, oscuro y negativo, y también la conversión en esquema historiográfico de estas ideas, aplicadas a Francia, Italia y Alemania.

Dedica el cap. I a examinar la relación que los historiadores franceses del Romanticismo establecieron entre la Edad Media y el Renacimiento. Si bien los románticos hicieron suyo el concepto del desarrollo histórico y valoraron según nuevos puntos de vista las características del período medieval y también del Renacimiento, no se consiguió, sin embargo, en el siglo XIX reunir y armonizar los dos períodos; en este punto persistió la idea, heredada de los siglos precedentes, de una oposición entre ambos.

En el cap. II estudia la creación de las metáforas con que los primeros renacentistas explicaron su posición crítica entre un período de oscuridad, que ellos querían superar, y un tiempo nuevo que enlazaría con las letras clásicas. Desde Petrarca, para el que el movimiento tenía un matiz político de resurrección de la gloria romana, los hombres de letras insistían en una cadena de expresiones: *restitutio, reviviscere, renascere, florire, ritorno*, etc. Los franceses recogieron estas expresiones, desde Jean de Montreuil hasta Rabelais y Amyot, que habla de *renaistre et florir*. No hay, sin embargo, conformidad entre italianos y franceses sobre el Medioevo: una coincidencia inicial existe en la confusión entre cultura y lengua que lleva a identificar los tiempos *bárbaros* con aquéllos en que se ha perdido la perfección del latín. El intervalo entre el período clásico y el de renovación es distinto: para los italianos Boecio fué el último escritor latino; para el humanismo francés del siglo XV, los antecedentes estaban en el siglo XII. Petrarca sostuvo a este propósito una polémica con las franceses en que los motivos políticos y religiosos (controversia Avignon-Roma) se mezclaban con los literarios. Para los franceses, la cultura clásica se inició en Grecia, pasó a Roma y de allí a Francia. Petrarca defiende, por su parte, la herencia de la *latinitas* para Roma. Acaba este capítulo con un interesante estudio de la expresión "luz-tinieblas," que los franceses, como los otros renacentistas, usaron con tanta frecuencia. Si bien apunta que Lucrecio usa esta dualidad (y podría añadirse que es una *oppositio* de las más frecuentes en la retórica clásica y medieval), Simone busca su origen en la tradición bíblica (Salm. CXI,4), continuada por San Juan y San Pablo y por Padres de la Iglesia y comentaristas: luz, "verdad de Cristo" y tinieblas, "error pagano." Petrarca y los renacentistas aplicaron la expresión a su caso, si bien extendían la luz a los clásicos, pues, aunque paganos, por el esfuerzo en conocer la sabiduría, eran nuncios de Cristo; así las obras clásicas fueron consideradas obras de verdad, de luz, según expresión nacida de la tradición medieval y adaptada a sus fines por los renacentistas.

Comenta en el cap. III un texto del humanista alemán Melantone en que se realiza un curioso compromiso entre la tesis francesa y la italiana: de la primera acepta la capacidad literaria del Medioevo y reconoce los efectos de la renovación carolingia pero no la escolástica, a la que acusa de ser un obstáculo para el Renacimiento por su apego al pensar aristotélico. La Escolástica, dice siguiendo a Lutero, interrumpió la independencia de la tradición cristiana y apartó al latín de sus fuentes. Así combina para sus fines los principios francés e italiano en una nueva concepción.

En el cap. IV trata el tema del título del libro: la diversa conciencia que los franceses tuvieron de esta renovacíon. Si bien la concepción les era común, fué diversamente interpretada. Así los primeros cenáculos quieren reunir la sabiduría con la elocuencia, de manera que no basta la expresión verdadera, sino que ha de ser bella. La natural madurez del esfuerzo renovador llevó en los primeros años del siglo XVI, en una época inigualada para la suerte de las letras, a plantear el problema de establecer textos correctos. De esta suerte la purificación y el establecimiento de lecciones satisfactorias movió a Lefèvre d'Etaples, Budé y Erasmo a cuidar distintas clases de textos. La edición del Nuevo Testamento de Erasmo (1516) es la culminación de este aspecto de la renovación. Este cuidado por los textos hizo que Budé independizara la ciencia filológica y defendiese su autonomía en el tratado *De Philologia*. Un punto extremo de esta posición se alcanza con la obra de Dolet para el que la pureza está expresada por Cicerón en cuanto a la forma y por la victoria de la libertad en el pensar. La misma rigidez de este refinamiento llevó al realce del francés; el anhelo de perfección se difundió por la Corte y llevó a la renovación del idioma románico. Las traducciones de obras clásicas y la creación poética vigorosa afirman un nuevo aspecto del concepto en que el Renacimiento es el retorno y la defensa del francés: Ronsard es el testimonio del triunfo final. Hacia la mitad del siglo XVI esta conciencia adopta la forma de un esquema historiográfico en dos períodos: uno, del que se tiene la conciencia de su desarrollo presente: el Renacimiento, y otro, anterior, que se supone por principio opuesto al presente. De esta suerte entró el esquema en los siglos siguientes.

En el cap. V examina la persistencia en el Renacimiento de la idea medieval del progreso histórico, oscurecida por la noción de la estabilidad de los clásicos respecto al hombre, adaptada por los humanistas en forma de un progreso cíclico. Giordano Bruno y otros autores reconocen, sin embargo, la idea medieval. Otros humanistas intentan conciliar ambas posiciones: Pico de la Mirandola y, entre los franceses, Peletier, Budé y Bodin unieron a la *renovatio* una conciencia de superación del hombre moderno sobre el antiguo, que es otro fruto maduro del Renacimiento.

Tal es en breve resumen el contenido del libro, en extremo sugeridor en cuanto a los distintos aspectos que va tratando en los varios capítulos, cada uno de los cuales ofrece interesantes testimonios sobre las cuestiones indicadas, de manera que, aunque diversos, se complementan unos con otros en torno a la idea fundamental de la conciencia del Renacimiento en su tiempo.

FRANCISCO LÓPEZ ESTRADA

Universidad de Sevilla

ALPHONSE DAUDET. By G. V. Dobie. London: Nelson, 1949. xiii, 306 p.

Je travaille depuis deux ans à un livre sur Daudet. La publication du beau volume de Mme Vera Dobie, qui y avait travaillé plus de vingt ans, ne fait cependant pas double emploi avec mon projet. Il m'inspire une joie sans mélange puisqu'il contient un trésor de matières biographiques, qui, dans les circonstances actuelles, m'aurait été inaccessible. Mme Dobie avait eu la persévérance, le flair et le talent de réunir ces matières à un moment où la compagne du grand écrivain et une partie de ses fidèles pouvaient encore lui faire des confidences, souligner des centres de gravité dans sa vie et dans son œuvre; et elle se donnait le temps d'attendre ces confidences, de les comparer les unes aux autres, de procéder à tel interrogatoire sur faits et articles; en un mot: d'être aussi véridique et aussi objective que le permet la hantise continue par un souvenir qui remplit toute notre vie.

Ce n'est pas seulement l'excellente note bibliographique ajoutée au texte du

livre, qui nous permet de faire une idée du sérieux de ce travail; ni seulement la circonspection avec laquelle Mme Dobie tranche enfin des questions épineuses longuement débattues, telles que la mesure de collaboration de Paul Arène aux *Lettres de mon moulin* ou l'"incident Daudet-Tourguéneff." Le livre entier, chaque pas de Daudet ayant laissé des traces, chaque appréciation de ses œuvres, trahit un jugement sain, une robustesse de bon sens alliée au plus sincère désir de compréhension... *Magis amica veritas*, oui; mais il ne faut pas exagérer: le lecteur assez heureusement inspiré pour lire le livre de Mme Dobie s'intéressera avant tout à la vérité envisagée du point de vue de Daudet et de son cercle.

L'érudit proprement dit lui saura gré de l'exactitude de ses données et des nombreuses mises au point auxquelles elle procède; le curieux des idées et du mouvement littéraire appréciera la "densité" de l'atmosphère où son héros ne reste jamais tout à fait seul—n'est-il pas le personnage saillant de toute une époque ou, pour le moins, de tout un groupe? Je ne parle pas ici du lecteur tout court, qui, comme dans un roman, suit le fil d'une vie des plus intéressantes, séduit d'avance par une table des matières où abondent les titres de chapitres tels que "Fog in Lyons," "Allons voir Paris!," "From the Alps to the Académie" ou "The Visitor long foreseen." On dirait des chapitres de tel roman de Dickens—"le Daudet anglais"—et c'est encore un problème qui attendait sa solution (pp. 112-113 et *passim*.)

Il va sans dire, et ces titres le montrent assez, que la biographie domine l'analyse des œuvres. Toute la structure de l'ouvrage le met en relief, puisqu'il commence par les mots "I was born" et se termine par l'arrivée du "visiteur" et le récit de l'enterrement.

Tout écrivain d'un sillage aussi profond que celui de Daudet est un problème en soi. Une monographie aussi importante que celle de Mme Dobie voit s'adresser, en plus, d'autres questions d'ordre plus "collectif." Pour moi, la question du *naturalisme* de Daudet entraîne la question du naturalisme en général, soulevée de nouveau par l'esthétique marxiste qui prône le réalisme et condamne le naturalisme; mais que doit se poser tout critique consciencieux. En dépit de manifestes catégoriques (surtout de Zola) et d'une profusion d'articles de combat, le naturalisme français réunit sous le drapeau de Médan des personnalités trop fortes pour leur trouver un commun dénominateur de valeur pratique réelle. Les Goncourt et Zola qui ont en commun l'appréciation excessive du Milieu et la recherche des cas pathologiques, se séparent sur la limite du pessimisme et de l'optimisme; le romantisme foncier et l'appétit idéologique de Zola l'écarte de Maupassant. Daudet ne ressemble à aucun d'entre eux sinon par l'observation exacte et par la peur des illusions. Il reste indépendant (voir p. 198) et il s'enferme dans l'atmosphère de sa propre sensibilité et de son culte de la beauté. Il est profondément humain, et cela l'empêcherait d'être un naturaliste typique dans le sens de Zola, qui n'oublie que trop souvent qu'il y a du bon au fond de la bête humaine et que celle-ci réclame à tout moment notre pitié.

Sans trop y insister, Mme Vera Dobie, de sa manière discrète, nous fait comprendre, entre bien d'autres, cette vérité.

J. Hankiss

Université de Debrecen, Hongrie

Nuevos puntos de vista sobre la "Cartuja de Parma" y las ideas de Stendhal. By Alberto Falcionelli. Mendoza: U. N. C. "Cuadernos de Estudios Franceses," 1949. xvi, 196 p.

Les "points de vue nouveaux" que le titre de l'ouvrage promet aux stendhaliens sont dus surtout à une découverte. M. Falcionelli nous prouve que la Parme de

la *Chartreuse* n'est autre que la Modène[1] de l'époque de la Sainte-Alliance, principauté végétant sous le sceptre d'une branche très cadette des Habsbourg. Ses arguments tiennent tête à l'investigation la plus scrupuleuse. Ranuce-Ernest IV et V ont leurs pendants incontestables dans la réalité modénaise: ils s'appellent François IV et François V de Habsbourg; et la situation politique reflétée par le roman correspond à celle qui pesait sur les sujets infortunés de ces tyrans de petit format. Une partie des aventures de Fabrice del Dongo est modelée sur l'évasion du chevalier Verratti.

L'importance de la découverte se trouve rehaussée par le fait que M. Falcionelli peut être considéré comme l'expert moderne de l'histoire du carbonarisme. S'il assigne au roman de Stendhal une place parmi les allégories politiques, nous n'avons qu'à accepter son expertise la conscience tranquille.

Mais n'a-t-on pas l'impression que les protagonistes de la *Chartreuse de Parme*, ceux qui semblent[2] jouir des sympathies de l'auteur, sont en quelque sorte "collaborateurs" du tyran tout en le méprisant et tout en contrecarrant ses sévices? Mosca n'est-il pas son ministre? et la Sanseverina, maîtresse de Mosca et ornement de la cour? Fabrice, cet *ingénu* aux joues roses et au cœur innocent, qu'est-il autre chose qu'une balle dans le jeu de Mosca et de Gina?

C'est ici que la découverte de M. Falcionelli se double d'une analyse ingénieuse de l'esprit dans lequel le roman est conçu. Tout ce qui nous choque dans les actes des personnages principaux, jusqu'à leur amoralité, contribue à condamner le régime de l'oppression étrangère, de la réaction étroite. C'est une moralité "forcée," comme pour dire: "Voyez les conséquences inévitables d'un autoritaire: les individus les plus doués et les plus sympathiques y dégénèrent." L'ironie stendhalienne ne serait, à ce compte, qu'une arme—à double tranchant, hélas!—entre les mains des partisans de la libération.

La belle et intelligente comtesse est acculée à nouer des intrigues, à se rendre coupable d'un crime; le Cavour de Modène, Mosca, se voit condamné à mentir sans cesse, à faire de la politique personnelle; Fabrice del Dongo, prêtre, a une liaison assez peu justifiée: tout le monde agit à l'encontre de sa nature profonde. Leur "chasse au bonheur" n'est qu'un pis-aller; ils pourraient faire autre chose, être heureux d'un autre bonheur, s'ils étaient libres. On pense au Lorenzaccio de Musset et au Lorenzino de Dumas père, dont le héros s'avilit pour préparer la délivrance de sa patrie.

C'est un Stendhal assez nouveau, qui ne fait aucun tort au Stendhal que nous connaissons, bien au contraire. Sa science des complications psychologiques ne fait que gagner à la mise en relief de cette arrière-pensée profonde. Et son culte de l'énergie qui lui conseille, entre autres, de réunir aux réalités prises dans le présent de Modène une aventure empruntée à la réalité de la Renaissance, devient, grâce à M. Falcionelli, un peu moins rigide, moins obstiné, moins difficile à justifier. On a besoin d'énergies surnuméraires et d'un courage à toute épreuve quand on prépare la liberté.

J. HANKISS

Université de Debrecen, Hongrie

VOM HEIMWEH. By Fritz Ernst. Zürich: Fretz & Wasmuth Verlag, 1949. 127 p.

Professor Ernst, the noted comparatist from Zürich, best known, perhaps, for his beautiful book on *Die Schweiz als geistige Mittlerin, von Muralt bis Jacob*

[1] Même procédé que dans *le Rouge et le Noir* où Besançon est mis à la place de Grenoble.

[2] Car leur morale indépendante nous tient en suspens sur les intentions de l'auteur. Ne nous tend-il pas un piège, ce maître de l'ironie?

Burckhardt (1932), can always be depended on to turn his attention to some fascinating problem bringing to light certain international aspects of Swiss literature and mentality. The present essay, as comparative as any study in the field of thematology and of preromantic terminology, sketches the Swiss origins and the gradual international spread of the word and concept of "Heimweh" during the eighteenth century, and in the second part of the booklet (pp. 61-127) provides the reader with a reproduction of the most pertinent descriptive texts.

Johannes Hofer, town physician of Basel, in 1688 was the first to discuss the phenomenon in his *Dissertatio medica de Nostalgia oder Heimwehe* and to provide the German term with a learned translation ("*Nostalgias* vocabulum, origine graecum, et quidem duabus ex vocibus compositum, quorum alterum *nostos* Reditum in Patriam, alterum *algos* dolorem aut tristitiam significat"). Ernst traces the history of the word, its different definitions, and its applicability also to other nations. Among the various men discussed we might mention Theodor Zwinger—not because he suggested the learned term "Pothopatridalgia" for "Heimweh" but because, in his *Cantilena Helvetica, der Kühe-Reyen dicta* (1710), he called attention to the "ranz des vaches" as one of the possible causes for "Heimweh."

In French literature the Abbé Du Bos, in his *Réflexions critiques* of 1719, was the first to incorporate "hemvé" in the French vocabulary and to analyze it (e.g., "Le *Hemvé* ne devient une peine de l'esprit que parce qu'il est réellement une peine du corps"); after him, the *Encyclopédie* also repeatedly discussed the term, to the extent, for instance, of publishing an article on "Heimweh" by Albrecht von Haller in 1777. Rousseau, of course, was the most significant French-Swiss writer in this connection (see his letter to the Maréchal de Luxembourg, January 20, 1765, and also his *Dictionnaire de musique*)—more significant, for instance, than Bridel in his *Le Lac Léman* (1782). Giampietro Pellegrini, the Venetian translator of the *Avis au peuple sur sa santé* of 1761, in which the Swiss physician, S. A. Tissot, had discussed "le Heimweh ou mal du pays," elaborated on that phenomenon in an Italian treatise of his own, *Del male volgarmente chiamato Heimweh, o Nostalgia*, of 1766, in which he endeavored to restrict the illness to Switzerland alone ("L'Heimweh detto ancora mal del paese, è una malattia, che si può dir nazionale, la quale fino ad ora non è stata riconosciuta comune ad alcuna nazione, fuorchè a quella degli Svizzeri"). In the realm of German literature it was, strange to say, Wieland who, in *An Olympia*, first used the term, and he did it in a definitely religious sense, speaking of the "Heimweh nach dem Himmel." Jung-Stilling, in 1794, wrote a novel *Das Heimweh*, and Novalis in his *Fragmente* applied the word philosophically ("Die Philosophie ist eigentlich Heimweh, ein Trieb, überall zu Hause zu sein").

Professor Ernst, in concluding his study, attaches a deep significance to the fact that this somewhat restricted Swiss term, through France, became propagated in the rest of the world and that in Germany it received a religious connotation: "Tief eindrucksvoll bleibt hüben und drüben die besondere Ausprägung eines vom schweizerischen Mutterboden losgelösten Gefühls: Frankreich einverleibt es dem Erdkreis, Deutschland dem All. Das Heimweh wird in Frankreich universal, in Deutschland religiös. Der französische Geist erinnert uns an unser Menschentum, der deutsche an unsre überirdische Bestimmung."

W. P. F.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Alonso, Dámaso. Poesía española: Ensayo de métodos y límites estilísticos: Garcilaso, Fray Luis de León, San Juan de la Cruz, Góngora, Lope de Vega, Quevedo. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1950. 675 p.

Appleton, William W. A Cycle of Cathay: The Chinese Vogue in England during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. xii, 182 p.

Bacon, Wallace A. William Warner's Syrinx or A Sevenfold History. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1950. lxxxvi, 223 p.

Bonwit, Marianne. Gustave Flaubert et le principe d'impassibilité. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1950. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. XXXIII, No. 4, pp. 263-420.

Castro, Américo. Ensayo de historiología: analogías y diferencias entre hispanos y musulmanes. New York: Franz C. Feger, 1950. 44 p.

Chiappelli, Fredi. Langage traditionnel et langage personnel dans la poésie italienne contemporaine. Neuchâtel: Université de Neuchâtel. 1951. 109 p.

Fowlie, Wallace. Pantomime: A Journal of Rehearsals. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1951. 246 p.

Gilman, Stephen. Cervantes y Avellaneda: Estudio de una imitación. México: El Colegio de Mexico, 1951. 182 p.

Gilson, Etienne. Heloise and Abelard. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1951. xvii, 194 p.

Grunebaum, Gustave E. von. A Tenth-Century Document of Arab Literary Theory and Criticism: The Sections of Poetry of al-Baqillâni's I'jaz al-Qur'an. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950. xxii, 128 p.

Hewlett, Dorothy. A Life of John Keats. Second ed. revised and enlarged. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1950. 408 p.

Lectures in the Humanities, 1949-50: W. P. Friederich, Some German Contributions to European Literature. P. Russel, The New Face of Journalism. S. A. Emery, Philosophy in the Humanities. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1950. 45 p.

Works in the Humanities Published in Great Britain 1939-1946. A Selective List Prepared by Louise Bogan. Washington: Library of Congress, Oct. 1950. iii, 123 p. (Mimeographed.)

Malkiel, María Rosa Lida de. Juan de Mena poeta del prerrenacimiento español. México: El Colegio de Mexico, 1950. 589 p.

Olguín, Manuel. Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo's Theory of Art, Aesthetics, and Criticism. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1950. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. XXVIII, No. 6, pp. viii, 33-358.)

ANNOUNCEMENT

The Romanic Review (Columbia University Press, $5.00 a year) is campaigning for needed subscriptions. *CL* urges its readers to give tangible support to this indispensable scholarly journal.